Submitted to the Annals of Probability

arXiv:0904.1950v2 [math.PR] 11 Feb 2010

UNIFORM BOUNDS FOR NORMS OF SUMS OF INDEPENDENT RANDOM FUNCTIONS

By Alexander Goldenshluger [*] and Oleg Lepski [†]

University of Haifa and Université Aix–Marseille I

In this paper we develop a general machinery for finding explicit uniform probability and moment bounds on sub-additive positive functionals of random processes. Using the developed general technique we derive uniform bounds on the $\mathbb{L}_s$–norms of empirical and regression–type processes. Usefulness of the obtained results is illustrated by application to the processes appearing in kernel density estimation and in nonparametric estimation of regression functions.

1. Introduction.

1.1. *General setting.* Let $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{H}$ be linear topological spaces, $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathrm{P})$ be a complete probability space, and let $\xi : \mathfrak{H} \times \Omega \to \mathfrak{S}$ be a linear and continuous on $\mathfrak{H}$ mapping. Let $\Psi : \mathfrak{S} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a given *sub-additive* functional. Suppose that there exist functions $A : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, $B : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $U : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{\Psi(\xi_\theta) - U(\theta) \geq z\right\} \leq g\left(\frac{z^2}{A^2(\theta) + B(\theta) z}\right), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathfrak{H}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a monotone decreasing to zero function.

Let Θ be a fixed subset of $\mathfrak{H}$. In this paper, under rather general assumptions on U, A, B and Θ, we establish uniform probability and moment bounds of the following type: for any $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $y > 0$

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\Big[\Psi(\xi_\theta) - u_\epsilon\big(1 + \sqrt{y}\lambda_A + y\lambda_B\big)U(\theta)\Big] \geq 0\right\} \;\leq\; P_{\epsilon,g}(y), \tag{1.2}$$

$$\mathrm{E}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\Big[\Psi(\xi_\theta) - u_\epsilon\big(1 + \sqrt{y}\lambda_A + y\lambda_B\big)U(\theta)\Big]_+^q \;\leq\; E_{\epsilon,g}(y), \qquad q \geq 1. \tag{1.3}$$

Here λ_A and λ_B are the quantities completely determined by U, A, Θ and U, B, Θ respectively, and the inequalities (1.2) and (1.3) hold if these quantities are finite; $P_{\epsilon,g}(\cdot)$ and $E_{\epsilon,g}(\cdot)$ are continuous decreasing to zero functions completely determined by ϵ and g; and the factor u_ϵ is such that $u_\epsilon \to 1$, $\epsilon \to 0$. We present explicit expressions for all quantities appearing in (1.2) and (1.3).

In order to derive (1.2) and (1.3) from (1.1) we assume that the set Θ is the image of a totally bounded set in some metric space under a continuous mapping. Namely, if $(\mathfrak{Z}, \mathrm{d})$ is a metric space, and $\mathbb{Z}$ is a totally bounded subset of $(\mathfrak{Z}, \mathrm{d})$ then we assume that there exists a *continuous* mapping ϕ from $\mathfrak{Z}$ to $\mathfrak{H}$ such that

$$\Theta = \{\theta \in \mathfrak{H} : \theta = \phi[\zeta],\ \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}\}. \tag{1.4}$$

---

[*] Supported by the ISF grant 389/07

[†] Supported by the grant ANR-07-BLAN-0234

[‡] Acknowledgment: We thank two anonymous referees for useful comments that led to significant improvements in the presentation.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60E15; secondary 62G07, 62G08

Keywords and phrases: empirical processes, concentration inequalities, kernel density estimation, regression

Let $N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\delta)$, $\delta > 0$ be the minimal number of the balls in the metric d needed to cover $\mathbb{Z}$. The inequalities (1.2) and (1.3) are proved under some condition that relates $N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$. It is worth mentioning that in particular examples the parametrization $\Theta = \phi[\mathbb{Z}]$ is often natural, while the metric d may have a rather unusual form.

The inequalities (1.2) and (1.3) can be considered as a refinement of usual bounds on the tail distribution of suprema of random functions. In particular, probability and moment bounds for $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\Psi(\xi_\theta)$ can be easily derived from (1.2) and (1.3). The well–known concentration results deal with deviation of the supremum of a random process from the expectation of this supremum, and estimation of the expectation is a separate rather difficult problem. In contrast, in this paper we develop *explicit* uniform bounds on the whole trajectory $\{\Psi(\xi_\theta), \theta \in \Theta\}$. The inequality in (1.1) provides the basic step in the development of such uniform probability bounds. The usual technique is based on the *chaining argument* that repeatedly applies the inequality in (1.1) to increments of the considered random process [see, e.g., Ledoux and Talagrand (1991) and (van der Vaart and Wellner 1996, Section 2.2)].

The most interesting phenomena can be observed when a sequence of random mappings $\{\xi_\theta^{(n)}, \theta \in \mathfrak{H}\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is considered. There exists a class of problems where the quantities λ_A and λ_B depend on n, and $\lambda_A \to 0$, $\lambda_B \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Under these circumstances, one can choose $y = y_n \to \infty$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon_n \to 0$ such that

$$P_{\epsilon,g}(y_n) \to 0, \qquad E_{\epsilon,g}(y_n) \to 0, \;\; n \to \infty. \tag{1.5}$$

and, at the same time,

$$u_{\epsilon_n}\big(1 + \sqrt{y_n}\lambda_A + y_n\lambda_B\big)U(\cdot) \to U(\cdot), \;\; n \to \infty. \tag{1.6}$$

The relation in (1.5) means that $u_{\epsilon_n}\big(1 + \sqrt{y_n}\lambda_A + y_n\lambda_B\big)U(\cdot)$ is indeed a uniform upper bound for $\Psi\big(\xi_\theta^{(n)}\big)$ on Θ, while (1.6) indicates that for large n this uniform bound is nearly as good as a non–uniform bound $U(\cdot)$ given in (1.1). Typically for a fixed $y > 0$ we have $P_{\epsilon,g}(y) \to \infty$ and $E_{\epsilon,g}(y) \to \infty$ as $\epsilon \to 0$; therefore, in order to get (1.5) and (1.6), $\epsilon_n \to 0$ and $y_n \to \infty$ should be calibrated in an appropriate way.

The general setting outlined above includes important specific problems that are in the focus of the present paper. We consider sequences of random mappings that are sums of real–valued random functions defined on some measurable space (here the parameter $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is the number of summands). We are interested in uniform bounds on the norms of such random functions; thus the sub–additive functional of interest Ψ is the $\mathbb{L}_s$-norm, $s \geq 1$. First the non–uniform bound (1.1) is established, and then the inequalities of the type (1.2) and (1.3) are derived. It is shown that (1.5) and (1.6) hold under mild assumptions on the parametric set Θ. We also discuss sharpness of the non–uniform inequality in (1.1).

1.2. *Norms of sums of independent random functions.* Let $\big(\mathcal{T}, \mathfrak{T}, \tau\big)$ and $\big(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{X}, \nu\big)$ be σ-finite spaces, and let $\mathcal{X}$ be a separable Banach space. Consider an $\mathcal{X}$-valued random element X defined on the complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathrm{P})$ and having the density f with respect to the measure ν. Let ε be a real random variable defined on the same probability space, independent of X and having a symmetric distribution.

For any $\big(\mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{X}\big)$-measurable function w on $\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}$ and for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define the random functions

$$\xi_w(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{n}\big[w(t, X_i) - \mathbb{E}w(t, X)\big], \quad \eta_w(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} w(t, X_i)\varepsilon_i, \tag{1.7}$$

where (X_i, ε_i), $i = 1, \dots, n$, are independent copies of (X, ε). Put for $1 \le s < \infty$

$$\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} = \left[\int |\xi_w(t)|^s \, \tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{1/s}, \quad \|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau} = \left[\int |\eta_w(t)|^s \, \tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{1/s}.$$

We are interested in uniform bounds of the type (1.2)–(1.3) for $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ and $\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}$ when $w \in \mathcal{W}$, where $\mathcal{W}$ is a given set of $(\mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{X})$-measurable functions. This setup is a specific case of the general framework with $\Psi(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_{s,\tau}$, $\theta = w$ and $\Theta = \mathcal{W}$. More precisely, if ψ_w denotes either ξ_w or η_w, and if $\mathbb{P}$ is the probability law of $X_1, \dots, X_n$ (when ξ_w is studied) or of $(X_1, \varepsilon_1), \dots, (X_n, \varepsilon_n)$ (when η_w is studied) then we want to find a functional $U(\psi_w) = U_\psi(w, f)$ such that (1.1) holds and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \Big[\|\psi_w\|_{s,\tau} - u_\epsilon \big(1 + \sqrt{y}\lambda_A + y\lambda_B\big) U_\psi(w, f) \Big] \ge 0 \right\} \;\le\; P_{\epsilon,g}(y), \tag{1.8}$$

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \Big[\|\psi_w\|_{s,\tau} - u_\epsilon \big(1 + \sqrt{y}\lambda_A + y\lambda_B\big) U_\psi(w, f) \Big]_+^q \;\le\; E_{\epsilon,g}(y), \qquad q \ge 1. \tag{1.9}$$

Note that $\{\xi_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ is the *empirical process*. In the sequel we refer to $\{\eta_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ as the *regression–type process* as it naturally appears in nonparametric estimation of regression functions. In the regression context X_i are the design variables while ε_i are the random noise variables.

Uniform probability and moment bounds for empirical processes are a subject of vast literature, see, e.g., Alexander (1984), Talagrand (1994), van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), Massart (2000), Bousquet (2002), Giné and Koltchinskii (2006) among many others. Such bounds play an important role in establishing the laws of iterative logarithm and central limit theorems [see, e.g., Alexander (1984) and Giné and Zinn (1984)]. However we are not aware of works studying uniform bounds of the type (1.8)–(1.9) satisfying (1.5) and (1.6) for the $\mathbb{L}_s$–norms of such processes.

Apart from the pure probabilistic interest, development of uniform bounds on the $\mathbb{L}_s$–norms of processes $\{\xi_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ and $\{\eta_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ is motivated by problems of adaptive estimation arising in nonparametric statistics. In particular, the processes $\{\xi_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ and $\{\eta_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ represent stochastic errors of linear estimators with the weight w in the density estimation and nonparametric regression models respectively. Uniform bounds on the error process are key technical tools in development of virtually all adaptive estimation procedures [see, e.g., Barron et al. (1999), Devroye and Lugosi (2001) Cavalier and Golubev (2006), Goldenshluger and Lepski (2008, 2009), and Golubev and Spokoiny (2009)].

The *kernel density estimator process* is a particular case of the empirical process $\{\xi_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ that was frequently studied in the probabilistic literature. It is associated with the weight function w given by

$$w(t, x) = \frac{1}{n \prod_{i=1}^d h_i} K\left(\frac{t - x}{h}\right), \qquad x \in \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d,\ t \in \mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.10}$$

where $K : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a kernel, $h = (h_1, \dots, h_d)$ is the bandwidth vector, and u/v denotes the coordinate–wise division for $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Limit laws for the $\mathbb{L}_s$–norms of the kernel density estimators were derived in Beirlant and Mason (1995); Dümbgen and Fatalov (2002) study exact asymptotics for the large/moderate deviation probabilities. Giné, Mason and Zaitsev (2003) investigate weak convergence of the $\mathbb{L}_1$–norm kernel density estimator process indexed by a class of kernels under entropy conditions. For other closely related work see Einmahl and Mason (2000), Giné, Koltchinski and Zinn (2004), Giné and Nikl (2008) and references therein. We remark that the kernel density estimator process is naturally parametrized by $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a set of bandwidths and $\mathcal{K}$ is a family of kernels. However, the distance d induced on $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}$ is rather special, see Section 3.4. The *convolution kernel density estimator process* will be also studied in Section 3.4.

The inequalities (1.8)–(1.9) are useful for constructing statistical procedures provided that the following requirements are met.

- (i) *Explicit expression for $U_\psi(w, f)$.* Typically the bound $U_\psi(w, f)$ is directly involved in the construction of statistical procedures; thus it should be explicitly given.
- (ii) *Minimal assumptions on $\mathcal{W}$.* This condition is dictated by a variety of problems where the inequalities (1.8)-(1.9) can be applied. In particular, the sets $\mathcal{W}$ may have a complicated structure [see, for instance, examples in Section 3.4].
- (iii) *Minimal assumptions on f.* The probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ (and the expectation $\mathbb{E}$) as well as the right hand sides of (1.8)–(1.9) are determined by the density f. Therefore we want to establish (1.8)–(1.9) under weak assumptions on f. In particular, we would like to emphasize that all our results are established for the set of all probability densities uniformly bounded by a given constant. No regularity conditions are supposed.
- (iv) *Minimal assumptions on the distribution of ε.* If the process $\{\eta_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ is considered, then the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ (and the expectation $\mathbb{E}$) is also determined by the distribution of ε. Therefore we would like to have (1.8)–(1.9) under mild assumptions on this distribution. We will see that the function g given in (1.1) depends on the distribution tail of ε.

Let us briefly discuss some consequences of the requirement (i) for the process $\{\xi_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$. Using the Talagrand concentration inequality we prove that (1.1) holds with $U_\xi(w, f) = \mathbb{E}\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$, on the space of functions $\mathfrak{H} = \{w : \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|w(\cdot, x)\|_{s,\tau} < \infty\}$. However this bound cannot be used in statistical problems at least for two reasons.

Firstly, it is implicit, and a reasonably sharp explicit upper bound $\bar{U}_\xi(w, f)$ on $U_\xi(w, f)$ should be used instead. Sometimes if the class $\mathcal{W}$ is not so complex (e.g., $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}$) one can find a constant c independent of w, f and n such that

$$c\bar{U}_\xi(w, f) \le U_\xi(w, f) \le \bar{U}_\xi(w, f).$$

In such cases $\bar{U}_\xi(w, f)$ can be regarded as a sharp bound on $U_\xi(w, f)$. We note, however, that establishing the above inequalities requires additional assumptions on $\mathcal{W}$ and f and requires non–trivial technical work. It seems that for more complex classes $\mathcal{W}$ the problem of finding an "optimal" upper estimate for $U_\xi(w, f)$ cannot be solved in the framework of probability theory. Contrary to that, the theory of adaptive nonparametric estimation is equipped with the optimality criterion, and an upper bound $\bar{U}_\xi(w, f)$ can be regarded as sharp if it leads to the optimal statistical procedure. Thus sharpness of $\bar{U}_\xi(w, f)$ can be assessed through the accuracy analysis of the resulting statistical procedure.

Secondly, $U_\xi(w, f)$ (and presumably its sharp upper bound $\bar{U}_\xi(w, f)$) depends on f. In the density estimation context where the process $\{\xi_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ appears, f is the parameter to be estimated. Therefore bounds depending on f cannot be used in construction of estimation procedures. A natural idea is to replace $U_\xi(w, f)$ by its empirical counterpart $\hat{U}_\xi(w)$ whose construction is based only on the observations $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. We adopt this strategy and establish the corresponding inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \Big[\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} - v_\epsilon\big(1 + \sqrt{y}\lambda_A + y\lambda_B\big)\hat{U}_\xi(w)\Big]_+^q \;\le\; \tilde{E}_{\epsilon,g}(y), \quad q \ge 1, \tag{1.11}$$

where $\tilde{E}_{\epsilon,g}(\cdot)$ differs from $E_{\epsilon,g}(\cdot)$ in (1.9) only by some absolute multiplicative factor, and, therefore, satisfies (1.5) if (1.6) holds for $\bar{U}_\xi(w, f)$. Here v_ϵ is bounded by some absolute constant and completely determined by ϵ and $\mathcal{W}$. We provide an explicit expression for v_ϵ.

Thus the requirement (i) leads to a new type of uniform bounds that are random. A natural question about sharpness of these bounds arises. In order to give an answer to this question, we prove that under mild assumptions on the class of weights $\mathcal{W}$ one can choose $\epsilon = \epsilon_n \to 0$ and $y_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ so that

$$v_{\epsilon_n}\big(1+\sqrt{y_n}\lambda_A + y_n\lambda_B\big) = 1+\tilde{\epsilon}_n, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\tilde{\epsilon}_n = 0, \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty}\tilde{E}_{\epsilon,g}(y_n) = 0,$$

and for any subset $\mathcal{W}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ and any $q \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\hat{U}_\xi(w)\Big]^q \leq \Big[(1+\tilde{\epsilon}_n)\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\bar{U}_\xi(w,f)\Big]^q + R_n(\mathcal{W}_0),$$

where the remainder term $R_n(\mathcal{W}_0)$ is asymptotically negligible in the sense that for any $\ell > 0$ one has $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\sup_{\mathcal{W}_0\subseteq\mathcal{W}}\big[n^\ell R_n(\mathcal{W}_0)\big] = 0$. Here $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the set of all probability densities uniformly bounded by a given constant [see (3.8)]. These results show that in asymptotic terms the random uniform bound is almost as good as the non–random one, and there is no loss of sharpness due to the use of the random uniform bound.

1.3. *Summary of results and organization of the paper.* In this paper we develop a general machinery for finding uniform upper bounds on sub-additive positive functionals of sums of independent random functions. We start with the general setting as outlined in Section 1.1 above, and establish inequalities of the type (1.2) and (1.3) [see Proposition 2]. Proofs of these results are based on the chaining and slicing/peeling techniques. The distinctive feature of our approach is that Θ is assumed to be an image of a subset $\mathbb{Z}$, of a metric space under some continuous mapping ϕ, i.e. $\Theta = \phi(\mathbb{Z})$ as in (1.4). Then chaining on Θ is performed according to the distance induced on Θ by the mapping ϕ.

Section 3 is devoted to a systematical study of the $\mathbb{L}_s$-norm of the empirical process $\{\xi_w,\, w\in\mathcal{W}\}$. First we derive an inequality on the tail probability of $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ for an individual function $w \in \mathcal{W}$ [see Theorem 1 in Section 3.1]. Here we use the Bernstein inequality for empirical processes proved by Bousquet (2002) and inequalities for norms of integral operators. Then in Section 3.2 we proceed with establishing uniform bounds. In Theorem 2 of Section 3.2.1 we derive uniform non-random bounds for $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$ that hold for all $s \geq 1$. In the case $s > 2$ the non–random bound depends on the density f; therefore for $s > 2$ we construct a random bound and present the corresponding result in Theorem 3. Theorems 2 and 3 hold for classes of weights $\mathcal{W}$ satisfying rather general conditions. In Section 3.3 we specialize results of Theorems 2 and 3 to the classes $\mathcal{W}$ of weights depending on the difference of their arguments. This allows to derive explicit both non–random and random uniform bounds on $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ under conditions on the weights which can be easily interpreted. The corresponding results are given in Theorems 4 and 5. We also present some asymptotic corollaries which demonstrate sharpness of the derived uniform bounds. Section 3.4 applies the results of Theorems 4 and 5 to special examples of the set $\mathcal{W}$. In particular, we consider the kernel density estimator process given by (1.10), and the convolution kernel density estimator processes. It turns out that corresponding results can be formulated in a unified way, and they are presented in Theorem 7.

In Section 4 we study $\mathbb{L}_s$-norm of the regression-type processes $\{\eta_w, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ given in (1.7). First we derive an inequality on the tail probability of $\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}$ for an individual function $w \in \mathcal{W}$ [Theorem 8 in Section 4.1]. This theorem is proved under two different types of conditions on the tail probability of the random variable ε. In Section 4.2 we present a non-random uniform bound for

$\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}$ for all $s \geq 1$ over the class of weights depending on the difference of their arguments. The corresponding result is given in Theorem 9, and some asymptotic results that follow from Theorem 9 are formulated in Corollary 7. Sections 5–10 contain proofs of main results of this paper. Proofs of auxiliary lemmas are given in Appendix.

2. Uniform bounds in general setting. In this section we establish uniform probability bounds for the supremum of a general sub–additive functional of a random process from the probability inequality for the individual process.

Let $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{H}$ be linear topological spaces, and $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, \mathrm{P})$ be a complete probability space. Let $\Psi : \mathfrak{S} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a given *sub-additive* functional, and Θ be a given subset of $\mathfrak{H}$. We consider the mapping $\xi : \mathfrak{H} \times \Omega \to \mathfrak{S}$ such that

- $\xi_\bullet$ is linear and continuous on $\mathfrak{H}$ P-almost surely;
- ξ_θ is $\mathfrak{A}$-measurable for any $\theta \in \mathfrak{H}$.

Assumption 1. *There exist functions $A : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, $B : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, $U : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that*

(i) *for any $z > 0$*

$$\mathrm{P}\big\{\Psi(\xi_\theta) - U(\theta) \geq z\big\} \;\leq\; g\bigg(\frac{z^2}{A^2(\theta) + B(\theta)z}\bigg), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathfrak{H};$$

(ii) *the function g is monotonically decreasing to* 0*;*

(iii) $$0 < r := \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} U(\theta) \;\leq\; \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} U(\theta) =: R \;\leq \infty.$$

Condition (i) is a Bernstein–type probability inequality on $\Psi(\xi_\theta)$ for a fixed $\theta \in \mathfrak{H}$. Based on Assumption 1, our goal is derive uniform probability and moment bounds of the type (1.2) and (1.3). For this purpose we suppose that the set Θ is parametrized in a special way; this assumption facilitates the use of the standard chaining technique and leads to quite natural conditions on the functions U, A and B.

Assumption 2. *Let $(\mathfrak{Z}, \mathrm{d})$ be a metric space, and let $\mathbb{Z}$ be a totally bounded subset of $(\mathfrak{Z}, \mathrm{d})$. There exists a continuous mapping ϕ from $\mathfrak{Z}$ to $\mathfrak{H}$ such that*

$$\Theta = \{\theta \in \mathfrak{H} : \theta = \phi[\zeta],\ \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Remark 1. *In statistical applications the set Θ is parametrized in a natural way. For instance, if, as in the introduction section, $\Psi(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_{s,\tau}$ and $\xi_\theta = \xi_w$ with w given by (1.10), then Θ is parametrized by the kernel and bandwidth $(K, h) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}$. The distance* d *on $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}$ may have a rather special form.*

Let Z be a subset of $\mathbb{Z}$. Define the following quantities:

$$\varkappa_U(Z) \;:=\; \sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2 \in Z} \frac{U\big(\phi[\zeta_1] - \phi[\zeta_2]\big)}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \;\vee\; \sup_{\zeta \in Z} U(\phi[\zeta]), \tag{2.1}$$

$$\Lambda_A(Z) \;:=\; \sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2 \in Z} \frac{A\big(\phi[\zeta_1] - \phi[\zeta_2]\big)}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \;\vee\; \sup_{\zeta \in Z} A(\phi[\zeta]), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\Lambda_B(Z) \;:=\; \sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2 \in Z} \frac{B\big(\phi[\zeta_1] - \phi[\zeta_2]\big)}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \;\vee\; \sup_{\zeta \in Z} B(\phi[\zeta]). \tag{2.3}$$

Let $N_{Z,\mathrm{d}}(\delta)$ denote the minimal number of balls of radius δ in the metric d needed to cover the set Z, and let $\mathcal{E}_{Z,\mathrm{d}}(\delta) = \ln\big[N_{Z,\mathrm{d}}(\delta)\big]$ be the δ–entropy of Z. For any $y > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ put

$$L^{(\epsilon)}_{g,Z}(y) = g\,(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\Big[N_{Z,\mathrm{d}}\big(\epsilon 2^{-k}\big)\Big]^2 g\Big(9y\,2^{k-3}k^{-2}\Big).$$

Key propositions. The next two statements are the main results of this section. Define

$$C^*(y,Z) := \sqrt{y}\Lambda_A(Z) + y\Lambda_B(Z), \;\; y > 0, \tag{2.4}$$

where Λ_A and Λ_B are given in (2.2) and (2.3).

Proposition 1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and let Z be a subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sup_{\zeta,\zeta'\in Z}\mathrm{d}(\zeta,\zeta') \le \epsilon/4$ and $\varkappa_U(Z) < \infty$. Then for all $y > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ one has*

$$\mathrm{P}\Big\{\sup_{\zeta\in Z}\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big) \ge (1+\epsilon)\big[\varkappa_U(Z) + C^*(y,Z)\big]\Big\} \le L^{(\epsilon)}_{g,Z}(y).$$

Remark 2. *Inspection of the proof of Proposition 1 shows that continuity of $\xi_\bullet$ on $\mathfrak{H}$ can be replaced by the assumption that $\Psi\big(\xi_\bullet\big)$ is continuous* P*-almost surely on $\phi[\mathbb{Z}]$ in the distance* d. *The latter assumption is often easier to verify in specific problems.*

Define

$$\Psi^*_u(y,Z) := \sup_{\zeta\in Z}\big\{\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big) - uC^*(y)U(\phi[\zeta])\big\}\,, \;\; y > 0, \tag{2.5}$$

where $Z \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}$, $u \ge 1$ is a constant, and $C^*(\cdot)$ is the function defined below in (2.9). We derive bounds on the tail probability and q-th moment of the random variable $\Psi^*_u(y,\mathbb{Z})$. Note that $\Psi^*_u(y,\mathbb{Z})$ is $\mathfrak{A}$-measurable for given y and u because the mapping $\zeta \mapsto \xi_{\phi[\zeta]}$ is P-almost surely continuous, and $\mathbb{Z}$ is a totally bounded set. By the same reason the supremum taken over any subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ will be measurable as well.

With r and R defined in Assumption 1(iii), for any $a \in [r,R]$ consider the following subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$:

$$\mathbb{Z}_a := \{\zeta \in \mathbb{Z} : a/2 < U(\phi[\zeta]) \le a\}\,. \tag{2.6}$$

In words, for given $a \in [r,R]$, $\mathbb{Z}_a$ is the *slice* of the parameter values $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}$ for which the function $U(\phi[\zeta])$ takes values between $a/2$ and a.

In what follows the quantities $\varkappa_U(\mathbb{Z}_a)$, $\Lambda_A\big(\mathbb{Z}_a\big)$, $\Lambda_B\big(\mathbb{Z}_a\big)$ and $L^{(\epsilon)}_{g,\mathbb{Z}_a}(y)$ will be considered as functions of $a \in [r,R]$. That is why, with slight abuse of notation, we will write

$$\varkappa_U(a) := \varkappa_U(\mathbb{Z}_a), \quad L^{(\epsilon)}_g(y,a) := L^{(\epsilon)}_{g,\mathbb{Z}_a}(y). \tag{2.7}$$

Put also

$$\Lambda_A := \sup_{a\in[r,R]} a^{-1}\Lambda_A\big(\mathbb{Z}_a\big); \quad \Lambda_B := \sup_{a\in[r,R]} a^{-1}\Lambda_B\big(\mathbb{Z}_a\big), \tag{2.8}$$

and let the function $C^*(\cdot)$ in (2.5) be defined as

$$C^*(y) := 1 + 2\sqrt{y}\Lambda_A + 2y\Lambda_B, \;\; y > 0. \tag{2.9}$$

Proposition 2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and let* $\varkappa_U(\mathbb{Z}) < \infty$*. If*

$$\varkappa_U(a) \le a, \quad \forall a \in [r, R], \tag{2.10}$$

and if $u_\epsilon = 2^\epsilon(1+\epsilon)$ *then for any* $\epsilon \in (0,1]$, $y > 0$ *and any* $q \ge 1$ *one has*

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, \mathbb{Z}) \ge 0\right\} \le N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8) \sum_{j=0}^{\epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r)-1} L_g^{(\epsilon)}\big(y, r2^{\epsilon(j+1)}\big), \tag{2.11}$$

$$\mathrm{E}\Big[\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, \mathbb{Z})\Big]_+^q \le N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\ \left[u_\epsilon C^*(y)\right]^q \sum_{j=0}^{\epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r)-1} \left[r2^{\epsilon(j+1)}\right]^q J_g^{(\epsilon)}\big(y, r2^{\epsilon(j+1)}\big), \tag{2.12}$$

where $J_g^{(\epsilon)}(z,a) := q\int_1^\infty (x-1)^{q-1} L_g^{(\epsilon)}(zx, a)\mathrm{d}x$*.*

Remark 3.

1. *Proposition 1 establishes an upper bound on the tail probability of the supremum of* $\Psi(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]})$ *over an arbitrary subset of* $\mathbb{Z}$ *contained in a ball of radius* $\epsilon/8$ *in the metric* d*. The proof of Proposition 2 uses this bound for balls* Z *of the radius* $\epsilon/8$ *that form a covering of* $\mathbb{Z}$*. Each ball* Z *is divided on* slices *on which the value of* $U(\phi[\zeta])$ *is roughly the same. Then the supremum over* $\mathbb{Z}$ *is bounded by the sum of suprema over the* slices*. This simple technique is often used in the literature on empirical processes where it is referred to as* peeling *or* slicing *[see, e.g., (van de Geer 2000, Section 5.3) and Giné and Koltchinskii (2006)].*
2. *Note that Proposition 2 holds for any distance* d *on* $\mathfrak{Z}$*. Therefore if* $\varkappa_U(a)$ *is proportional to* a*, the condition (2.10) can be enforced by rescaling the distance* d*.*

We now present a useful bound that can be easily derived from (2.11) and (2.12). Let

$$L_g^{(\epsilon)} := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}\big(\epsilon 2^{-k}\big)\right]^2 \sqrt{g\big(9\cdot 2^{k-3}k^{-2}\big)}. \tag{2.13}$$

Remark that for all $Z \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and $y \ge 1$

$$L_{g,Z}^{(\epsilon)}(y) \le g(y) + L_g^{(\epsilon)}\sqrt{g(y)}.$$

because $\inf_{k\ge 1} 2^k(k)^{-2} = 8/9$ and g is monotone decreasing. Therefore we arrive to the following corollary to Proposition 2.

Corollary 1. *If assumptions of Proposition 2 hold, and* $L_g^{(\epsilon)} < \infty$ *then for all* $y \ge 1$ *and* $\epsilon \in (0,1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}\left\{\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, \mathbb{Z}) \ge 0\right\} &\le N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\,\epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r)\Big[g(y) + L_g^{(\epsilon)}\sqrt{g(y)}\,\Big], \\
\mathrm{E}\Big[\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, \mathbb{Z})\Big]_+^q &\le N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\ \left[2^{2\epsilon}R(1+\epsilon)C^*(y)\right]^q \left[2^{q\epsilon}-1\right]^{-1} J_g^{(\epsilon)}(y),
\end{aligned}$$

where $J_g^{(\epsilon)}(z) = q\int_1^\infty (x-1)^{q-1}\Big[g(zx) + L_g^{(\epsilon)}\sqrt{g(zx)}\,\Big]\,\mathrm{d}x$*.*

3. Uniform bounds for norms of empirical processes. Based on the results obtained in Propositions 1 and 2, in this section we develop uniform bounds for the family $\{\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$, where ξ_w is defined in (1.7). The first step here is to check Assumption 1. For this purpose we establish an exponential inequality for $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ when the function $w \in \mathcal{W}$ is fixed. Next, using Corollary 1 we derive a *non-random* uniform bound and establish corresponding inequalities of the type (1.8)–(1.9) satisfying requirements (i)-(iv) of Introduction. We develop also a *random* uniform bound based on $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and derive an inequality of the type (1.11).

To proceed we need the following assumption.

Assumption (A1). *Let $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ be the countable dense subset of $\mathcal{X}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists $\bar{x} \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}$ such that*

$$\|w(\cdot, x) - w(\cdot, \bar{x})\|_{s,\tau} \leq \varepsilon.$$

In the sequel we consider only the sets $\mathcal{W}$ of $(\mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{X})$–measurable functions satisfying Assumption (A1). Let

$$\nu'(\mathrm{d}x) = f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x),$$

and for any $s \in [1, \infty]$ define

$$\Sigma_s(w, f) := \left[\int \|w(t, \cdot)\|^s_{2,\nu'}\, \tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{1/s} = \left[\int \left(\int |w(t, x)|^2 f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\right)^{s/2} \tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{1/s},$$

$$M_{s,\tau,\nu'}(w) := \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \|w(\cdot, x)\|_{s,\tau} \vee \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \|w(t, \cdot)\|_{s,\nu'}, \quad M_s(w) := M_{s,\tau,\nu}(w). \tag{3.1}$$

Let $c_1(s) := 15s/\ln s$, $s > 2$, $c_2(s)$ be the constant appearing below in the inequality (6.2) of Lemma 3, and define

$$c_3(s) := c_1(s) \vee c_2(s/(s-1)), \quad \forall s > 2, \quad c_*(s) := \begin{cases} 0, & 1 \leq s < 2, \\ 1, & s = 2, \\ c_3(s), & s > 2. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

It is worth mentioning that $c_1(s)$ is the best known constant in the Rosenthal inequality [see Johnson et al. (1985)], and in many particular examples $c_2(s) = 1$ [see Lemma 3 below]. Although $c_1(s)$ is defined for $s > 2$ only, it will be convenient to set $c_1(s) = 1$ if $s \in [1, 2]$. We use this convention in what follows without further mention.

3.1. *Probability bounds for fixed weight function.* For any $w \in \mathcal{W}$ we define

$$\rho_s(w, f) := \begin{cases} \left[\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w, f)\right] \wedge \left[4n^{1/s}M_s(w)\right], & s < 2, \\ \sqrt{n}\, M_2(w), & s = 2, \\ c_1(s)\left[\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w, f) + 2n^{1/s}M_s(w)\right], & s > 2, \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

$$\omega^2_s(w, f) := \begin{cases} M^2_s(w)\left[14n + 96n^{1/s}\right] & s < 2, \\ 6\, nM^2_{1,\tau,\nu'}(w) + 24\sqrt{n}M^2_2(w) & s = 2, \end{cases}$$

and if $s > 2$ then we set

$$\omega^2_s(w, f) := 6c_3(s)\left[n\, M^2_{\frac{2s}{s+2},\tau,\nu'}(w) + 4\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w, f)M_s(w) + 8n^{1/s}M^2_s(w)\right]. \tag{3.4}$$

Theorem 1. *Let $s \in [1,\infty)$ be fixed, and suppose that Assumption (A1) holds. If $M_s(w) < \infty$ then for any $z > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} \geq \rho_s(w,f) + z\big\} \quad \leq \quad \exp\left\{ - \frac{z^2}{\frac{1}{3}\omega_s^2(w,f) + \frac{4}{3}c_*(s)M_s(w)z} \right\}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $c_*(s)$ is given in (3.2).

Remark 4. *Because $c_*(s) = 0$ for $s \in [1,2)$, the distribution of the random variable $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ has a sub–Gaussian tail. In this case similar bounds can be obtained from the inequalities given in (Pinelis 1990, Theorem 2.1), (Pinelis 1994, Theorems 3.3–3.5) and (Ledoux and Talagrand 1991, Section 6.3). In particular, Theorem 1.2 of Pinelis (1990) gives the upper bound* $\exp\{-z^2/2nM_s^2(w)\}$ *which is better by a constant factor than our upper bound in (3.5) whenever $s \in [1,2)$. However, if $s \geq 2$ then the cited results are not accurate enough in the sense that the corresponding bounds do not satisfy relations (1.5)–(1.6) of Introduction. It seems that only concentration principle leads to tight upper bounds; that is why we use this unified method in our derivation.*

It is obvious that the upper bound of Theorem 1 remains valid if we replace $\rho_s(w,f)$, $\omega_s^2(w,f)$ and $M_s(w)$ by their upper bounds. The next result can be derived from Theorem 1 in the case $s \in [1,2)$.

Corollary 2. *Let $s \in [1,2)$ be fixed, and suppose that Assumption (A1) holds. If $M_s(w) < \infty$ then for every $z > 0$ and for all $n \geq 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} \ \geq \ 4n^{1/s}M_s(w) + z\big\} \quad \leq \quad \exp\left\{ - \frac{z^2}{37nM_s^2(w)} \right\}.$$

The result of the corollary is valid without any conditions on the density f. Moreover, neither the bound for $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$, nor the inequality right hand side depend on f. It is important to realize that the probability inequality of Corollary 2 is sharp in some cases. In particular, it is not too difficult to construct a density f such that $\Sigma_s(w,f) = +\infty$ for any function w satisfying rather general assumptions. In this case the established inequality seems to be sharp. On the other hand, for any density f satisfying a moment condition $\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f)$ can be bounded from above, up to a numerical constant, by $\sqrt{n}M_2(w)$ which is typically much smaller than $n^{1/s}M_s(w)$.

Several useful bounds can be derived from Theorem 1. In particular, it is shown at the end of the proof of Theorem 1 that for all $s \geq 2$ and $p \geq 1$

$$\Sigma_s(w,f) \leq M_2(w)\|\sqrt{f}\|_{s,\nu}, \quad M_{p,\tau,\nu'}(w) \leq \left[1 \vee \|f\|_\infty\right]^{1/p} M_p(w). \tag{3.6}$$

Using these inequalities we arrive to the following result.

Corollary 3. *Let $s > 2$ be fixed, and suppose that Assumption (A1) holds. If $M_s(w) < \infty$ then for every $z > 0$ and for all $n \geq 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} \geq \tilde{\rho}_s(w,f) + z\big\} \quad \leq \quad \exp\left\{ - \frac{z^2}{\frac{1}{3}\tilde{\omega}_s^2(w,f) + \frac{4}{3}c_3(s)M_s(w)z} \right\},$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_s(w,f) := c_1(s)\big[\sqrt{n}M_2(w)\|\sqrt{f}\|_{s,\nu} + 2n^{1/s}M_s(w)\big]$ *and*

$$\tilde{\omega}_s^2(w,f) := 6c_3(s)\Big\{n\big[1 \vee \|f\|_\infty\big]^{\frac{s+2}{s}} M^2_{\frac{2s}{s+2}}(w) + 4\sqrt{n}M_2(w)M_s(w)\|\sqrt{f}\|_{s,\nu} + 8n^{1/s}M_s^2(w)\Big\}.$$

3.2. *Uniform bounds.* Theorem 1 together with Corollaries 2 and 3 ensures that Assumption 1 is fulfilled for $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$. In this section we use Proposition 2 together with Theorem 1 in order to derive a uniform over $\mathcal{W}$ bounds on $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$.

Following the general setting of Section 2 we assume that $\mathcal{W}$ is a parametrized set of weights, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{W} = \{w : w = \phi[\zeta],\ \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \tag{3.7}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}$ is a totally bounded subset of some metric space $(\mathfrak{Z}, \mathrm{d})$. Thus any $w \in \mathcal{W}$ can be represented as $w = \phi[\zeta]$ for some $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}$. Recall that $N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\delta)$, $\delta > 0$ stands for the minimal number of balls of radius δ in the metric d needed to cover the set $\mathbb{Z}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\delta) = \ln[N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\delta)]$ is the δ–entropy of $\mathbb{Z}$.

The next assumption requires that the mapping $\zeta \mapsto \phi[\zeta] = w$ be continuous in the supremum norm.

Assumption (A2). *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \le \varepsilon$ one has*

$$\sup_t \sup_x |w_1(t,x) - w_2(t,x)| \le \gamma,$$

where $w_1(t,x) = \phi[\zeta_1](t,x)$, and $w_2(t,x) = \phi[\zeta_2](t,x)$.

Because ξ_w is linear in w, this assumption along with Assumption (A1) guarantees that all the considered objects are measurable.

Consider the class of densities

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ p : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} :\ p \ge 0,\ \int p = 1,\ \ \|p\|_\infty \le \mathrm{f}_\infty < \infty \right\}. \tag{3.8}$$

It is easily seen, that the inequalities of Theorem 1 and Corollary 3 can be made uniform with respect to the class $\mathcal{F}$. Indeed, the bound of Corollary 3 remains valid if one replaces $\|f\|_\infty$ and $\|\sqrt{f}\|_{s,\nu}$ by f_∞ and $\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2-1/s}$ respectively. From now on we suppose that $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and, without loss of generality, $\mathrm{f}_\infty \ge 1$.

3.2.1. *Uniform non-random bound.* Theorem 1 together with Corollaries 2 and 3 shows that Assumption 1 is fulfilled for $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ with $g(x) = e^{-x}$,

$$U(w) = U_\xi(w,f) := \begin{cases} 4n^{1/s} M_s(w), & s \in [1,2), \\ \sqrt{n} M_2(w), & s = 2, \\ c_1(s)\big[\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f) + 2n^{1/s} M_s(w)\big], & s > 2; \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

$$A^2(w) = A^2_\xi(w) := \begin{cases} 37nM_s^2(w), & s < 2, \\ 2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\, nM_1^2(w) + 8\sqrt{n}\ M_2^2(w) & s = 2, \\ 2c_3(s)\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\big[nM^2_{\frac{2s}{s+2}}(w) + 4\sqrt{n}M_2(w)M_s(w) + 8n^{\frac{1}{s}}M_s^2(w)\big], & s > 2; \end{cases}$$

and $B(w) = B_\xi(w) := \frac{4}{3}c_*(s)M_s(w)$, where $c_*(s)$ is defined in (3.2).

Put

$$r_\xi := \inf_{w\in\mathcal{W}} U_\xi(w,f), \quad R_\xi := \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} U_\xi(w,f). \tag{3.10}$$

Let $\varkappa_{U_\xi}(\cdot)$ be given by (2.7) with $U = U_\xi$, and

$$C^*_\xi(y) = 1 + 2\sqrt{y}\Lambda_{A_\xi} + 2y\Lambda_{B_\xi}, \quad y > 0,$$

where Λ_A and Λ_B are defined in (2.8); see also (2.9).

THEOREM 2. *Let $s \ge 1$ be fixed, (3.7) hold, and let Assumption (A2) be fulfilled. If $\varkappa_{U_\xi}(a) \le a$ for all $a \in [r_\xi, R_\xi]$ then for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $y \ge 1$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1]$ one has*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}\big[\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} - u_\epsilon C^*_\xi(y)U_\xi(w,f)\big] \ge 0\Big\} \;\le\; \frac{1}{\epsilon}N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\log_2\left(\frac{R_\xi}{r_\xi}\right)\big[1 + L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp}\big]e^{-y/2}\ ,$$

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}\Big[\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} - u_\epsilon C^*_\xi(y)U_\xi(w,f)\Big]_+^q \le \frac{2^{q(\epsilon+1)}u^q_\epsilon}{2^{q\epsilon}-1}\Gamma(q+1)N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\big[R_\xi C^*_\xi(1)\big]^q\big[1 + L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp}\big]e^{-y/2}\ ,$$

where $u_\epsilon = 2^\epsilon(1+\epsilon)$, $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma–function, and

$$L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\exp\Big\{2\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}\big(\epsilon 2^{-k}\big) - (9/16)\ 2^k k^{-2}\Big\}. \tag{3.11}$$

The proof follows immediately by application of Corollary 1, and noting that for $g(x) = e^{-x}$ the quantity $L^{(\epsilon)}_g$ is given by the above formula [cf. (2.13)], while $J^{(\epsilon)}_g(\cdot)$ for $g(x) = e^{-x}$ is bounded as follows

$$J^{(\epsilon)}_g(z) = q\int_1^\infty (x-1)^{q-1}\big[e^{-zx} + L^{(\epsilon)}_g\sqrt{e^{-zx}}\,\big]\mathrm{d}x \le \Gamma(q+1)\big[1 + L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp}\big](2/z)^q e^{-z/2}.$$

REMARK 5. *It is instructive to compare the results of Theorem 2 with those of Theorem 1 (and Corollaries 2 and 3). The uniform bound on $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ in Theorem 2 is determined by the individual bound $U_\xi(w,f)$ for a fixed weight $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and by the function $C^*_\xi(\cdot)$ which, in its turn, is computed on the basis of $A_\xi(w)$, $B_\xi(w)$ and $U_\xi(w,f)$. The function $C^*_\xi(\cdot)$ depends on the parametrization (3.7) and on the distance d on $\mathfrak{Z}$ via the quantities Λ_A and Λ_B [see (2.8)]. The right hand sides of the inequalities in Theorem 2 depend on massiveness of the set of weights $\mathcal{W}$ as measured by the entropy $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\cdot)$. Note also that these bounds decrease exponentially in y.*

3.2.2. *Uniform random bound.* The uniform non-random bounds on $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$ given in Theorem 2 depend on the density f via $U_\xi(w,f)$. As discussed in Introduction, this does not allow to use this bound in statistical problems. Our goal is to recover the statement of Theorem 2 (up to some numerical constants) with the unknown quantity $U_\xi(w,f)$ replaced by its estimator $\hat{U}_\xi(w)$. Note also that $U_\xi(w,f)$ of Theorem 2 depends on f only if $s > 2$; here the quantity depending on f is $\Sigma_s(w,f)$.

Assume that the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied, and let $s > 2$. For any $t \in \mathcal{T}$ define

$$\hat{\Sigma}_s(w) := \|S_w\|_{s,\tau}, \quad S^2_w(t) \ := \ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} w^2(t, X_i), \tag{3.12}$$

$$\hat{U}_\xi(w) \ := \ c_1(s)\Big[\sqrt{n}\,\hat{\Sigma}_s(w) + 2n^{1/s}M_s(w)\Big] \tag{3.13}$$

It is easily seen that $\hat{U}_\xi(w)$ is a reasonable estimate of $U_\xi(w,f)$ because under mild assumptions for any fixed $t \in \mathcal{T}$ by the law of large numbers

$$S_w^2(t) - \|w(t,\cdot)\|^2_{2,\nu'} \to 0,\ n \to \infty,\ \text{in probability.}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \big|\hat{\Sigma}_s(w) - \Sigma_s(w,f)\big|^2 &\leq \big\|S_w - \|w(\cdot,\cdot)\|_{2,\nu'}\big\|^2_{s,\tau} \leq \Bigg\|\sqrt{\big|S_w^2 - \|w(\cdot,\cdot)\|^2_{2,\nu'}\big|}\Bigg\|^2_{s,\tau} \\ &= \big\|S_w^2 - \|w(\cdot,\cdot)\|^2_{2,\nu'}\big\|_{\frac{s}{2},\tau} = \Bigg\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \big[w^2(\cdot,X_i) - \mathbb{E}w^2(\cdot,X)\big]\Bigg\|_{\frac{s}{2},\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $s > 2$ we have

$$\big|\hat{\Sigma}_s(w) - \Sigma_s(w,f)\big| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\|\xi_{w^2}\|_{\frac{s}{2},\tau}}{n}}, \tag{3.14}$$

that is, the difference between $\hat{\Sigma}_s(w)$ and $\Sigma_s(w,f)$ is controlled in terms of $\|\xi_{w^2}\|_{s/2,\tau}$. The idea now is to use Theorem 2 in order to find a non-random upper bound on $\|\xi_{w^2}\|_{s/2,\tau}$. One can expect that this bound will be much smaller than $\Sigma_s(w,f)$ provided that the function w is small enough. If this is true then $\hat{\Sigma}_s(w)$ approximates well $\Sigma_s(w,f)$, and it can be used instead of $\Sigma_s(w,f)$ in the definition of the uniform over $\mathcal{W}$ upper bound on $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$.

In order to control uniformly $\|\xi_{w^2}\|_{s/2,\tau}$ by applying Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 we need the following definitions. Put

$$\tilde{U}\big(w^2\big) := \begin{cases} 4n^{2/s}M_{s/2}\big(w^2\big), & s \in (2,4), \\ c_1(s/2)\big[\,\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}\sqrt{n}M_2\big(w^2\big) + 2n^{2/s}M_{s/2}\big(w^2\big)\big], & s \geq 4; \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{A}^2\big(w^2\big) := \begin{cases} 37nM^2_{s/2}\big(w^2\big), & s \in (2,4), \\ 2c_3(s/2)\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\Big[nM^2_{\frac{2s}{s+4}}\big(w^2\big) + 4\sqrt{n}M_2\big(w^2\big)M_{s/2}\big(w^2\big) + 8n^{2/s}M^2_{s/2}\big(w^2\big)\Big], & s \geq 4; \end{cases}$$

and $\tilde{B}\big(w^2\big) := \frac{4}{3}c_*(s/2)M_{s/2}\big(w^2\big)$, where $c_*(\cdot)$ is given in (3.2).

For any subset $Z \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, let $\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(Z)$, $\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}(Z)$, and $\Lambda_{\tilde{B}}(Z)$ be given by (2.1)–(2.3) with $U = \tilde{U}$, $A = \tilde{A}$ and $B = \tilde{B}$. With r_ξ and R_ξ defined in (3.10), let

$$\mathbb{Z}_a = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{Z} : a/2 < U_\xi(w,f) \leq a\}, \quad a \in [r_\xi, R_\xi], \tag{3.15}$$

and we set

$$\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(a) := \varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(\mathbb{Z}_a), \qquad \lambda_{\tilde{A}} = \sup_{a\in[r_\xi,R_\xi]} a^{-2}\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}\big(\mathbb{Z}_a\big), \qquad \lambda_{\tilde{B}} = \sup_{a\in[r_\xi,R_\xi]} a^{-2}\Lambda_{\tilde{B}}\big(\mathbb{Z}_a\big), \tag{3.16}$$

[cf. (2.7) and (2.8)]. It is important to emphasize here that in the definition of $\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}$, $\lambda_{\tilde{A}}$ and $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ we use the same set $\mathbb{Z}_a$ as in the definition of $\varkappa_{U_\xi}(\cdot)$, $\Lambda_{A_\xi}(\cdot)$ and $\Lambda_{B_\xi}(\cdot)$.

The next result establishes a random uniform bound on $\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau}$.

Theorem 3. *Let $s > 2$ be fixed, (3.7) hold, Assumption (A2) be fulfilled, and*

$$\varkappa_{U_\xi}(a) \le a, \quad \forall a \in [r_\xi, R_\xi]. \tag{3.17}$$

Let $\epsilon \in (0,1]$ be fixed, and there exist a positive number $\gamma < [4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)]^{-1}$ such that

$$\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(a) \le (\gamma a)^2, \quad \forall a \in [r_\xi, R_\xi]. \tag{3.18}$$

If y_γ denotes the root of the equation

$$\sqrt{y}\lambda_{\tilde{A}} + y\lambda_{\tilde{B}} = \gamma^2, \tag{3.19}$$

and if $y_\gamma > 1$ then:

(i). *For every $y \in [1, y_\gamma]$ one has*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} \Big\{ \|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} - \bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)\, C^*_\xi(y)\, \hat{U}_\xi(w) \Big\}_+^q \le T_{1,\epsilon} \big[C^*_\xi(y)\big]^q \exp\{-y/2\}\ ,$$

where $\bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma) := u_\epsilon[1 - 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma]^{-1}$, and $u_\epsilon = 2^\epsilon(1+\epsilon)$.

(ii). *For any subset $\mathcal{W}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ one has*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0} \hat{U}_\xi(w)\Big]^q \;&\le\; [1 + 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma]^q \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0} \big[U_\xi(w,f)\big]^q \\ &+\; T_{2,\epsilon}\Big[\sqrt{n} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0} M_s(w)\Big]^q \exp\{-y_\gamma/2\}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

The explicit expressions for the constants $T_{1,\epsilon}$ and $T_{2,\epsilon}$ are given in the beginning of the theorem proof.

Remark 6.

1. *Theorem 3 requires two sets of conditions: conditions of Theorem 2, and conditions on behavior of the functions $\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(\cdot)$, $\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}(\cdot)$ and $\Lambda_{\tilde{B}}(\cdot)$ on the slices $\mathbb{Z}_a$ defined through $U_\xi(w,f)$.*
2. *The parameter γ controls closeness of $\hat{U}_\xi(\cdot)$ to $U_\xi(\cdot, f)$: the smaller γ, the closer the random bound $\hat{U}_\xi(\cdot)$ to the non–random one $U_\xi(\cdot, f)$ [see (3.20)]. In this case we do not loose much if $U_\xi(\cdot, f)$ is replaced by its empirical counterpart $\hat{U}_\xi(w)$. Clearly, it is possible to choose γ small and simultaneously to keep y_γ large only if $\lambda_{\tilde{A}}$ and $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ are small enough. Fortunately, this is the case in many examples.*
3. *Note also that when γ approaches $[4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)]^{-1}$ the parameter $\bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)$ increases to infinity (clearly, we want to keep $\bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)$ as close to one as possible). Thus, the assumption $\gamma < [4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)]^{-1}$ is important; this poses a restriction on the parameter set $\mathcal{W}$. We conjecture that the following condition is necessary: for given $s \ge 2$ there exists a universal constant, say, $c(s)$, such that $\gamma < c(s)$.*

The next corollary to Theorem 3 will be useful in what follows.

Corollary 4. *The statements of Theorem 3 remain valid if $U_\xi(w,f)$ and $\hat{U}_\xi(w)$ are redefined as $\max\{U_\xi(w,f), \sqrt{n}M_2(w)\}$ and $\max\{\hat{U}_\xi(w), \sqrt{n}M_2(w)\}$ respectively.*

3.3. *Unifrom bounds for classes of weights depending on the difference of arguments.* As we have seen, the results and assumptions in Theorems 2 and 3 are stated in terms of the quantities (such as $\lambda_{\tilde{A}}$, $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$, y_γ) that are given implicitly. In particular, additional computations are still necessary in order to apply Theorems 2 and 3 in specific problems. In this section we specialize the results of Theorems 2 and 3 for the classes of weights $\mathcal{W}$ depending on the difference of arguments. Under natural and easily interpretable assumptions on the class of such weights we derive explicit uniform bounds on the norms of empirical processes.

Throughout this section $\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{T}=\mathbb{R}^d$, $\tau=\nu=\text{mes}$ is the Lebesgue measure, and we write $\|\cdot\|_s$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{s,\tau}$. In this section the class of weights $\mathcal{W}$ is a set of functions from $\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}$ of the following form

$$\mathcal{W}=\{w(t-x),\ w\in\mathcal{V}\}, \tag{3.21}$$

where $\mathcal{V}$ is a given set d–variate functions. For the sake of notational convenience we will identify the weight $w\in\mathcal{W}$ with the d–variate function $w\in\mathcal{V}$ in the definition of the process ξ_w and the quantities such as U_ξ, A_ξ, B_ξ etc. Thus when we write $w\in\mathcal{W}$ we mean the weight $w(\cdot-\cdot)$ while $w\in\mathcal{V}$ denotes the corresponding d-variate function; this should not lead to a confusion.

Let $(\mathfrak{Z},\mathrm{d})$ be a fixed metric space; as before, we suppose that $\mathcal{V}$ is parametrized by the parameter $\zeta\in\mathfrak{Z}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{V}=\{w: w=\phi[\zeta],\ \zeta\in\mathbb{Z}\}, \tag{3.22}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}$ is a totally bounded subset of the metric space $(\mathfrak{Z},\mathrm{d})$. Recall that $N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\delta)$, $\delta>0$ is the number of the balls of the radius δ in the metric d that form a minimal covering of the set $\mathbb{Z}$.

We need the following assumptions on the class of weights $\mathcal{W}$ (the functional set $\mathcal{V}$).

Assumption (W).

(W1) *The Lebesgue measure of support of all functions from $\mathcal{V}$ is finite, i.e.,*

$$\mu_* := \sup_{w\in\mathcal{V}} \text{mes}\big\{\text{supp}(w)\big\}<\infty. \tag{3.23}$$

(W2) *There exist real numbers $\alpha_1\in(0,1)$ and $\alpha_2\in(0,1)$ such that*

$$\text{mes}\Big\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d: |w(x)|\geq\alpha_1\|w\|_\infty\Big\}\geq\alpha_2\,\text{mes}\{\text{supp}(w)\},\quad \forall w\in\mathcal{V}.$$

(W3) *There exists a real number $\mu\geq 1$ such that*

$$n\,\text{mes}\big\{\text{supp}(w)\big\}\geq\mu,\quad\forall w\in\mathcal{V}.$$

(W4) *There exists a real number $\beta\in(0,1)$ such that*

$$\sup_{\delta\in(0,1)}\Big\{\ln\big[N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\delta)\big]-\delta^{-\beta}\Big\}=:C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta)<\infty.$$

Remark 7. *We will show that Assumption (W2) is fulfilled if $\mathcal{V}$ is a set of smooth functions. Assumption (W3) together with (W2) allows to establish relations between $\mathbb{L}_p$–norms of functions from $\mathcal{V}$; this will be extensively used in what follows. Assumption (W4) is a usual entropy condition. In particular, (W4) ensures that the quantity $L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp}$ in (3.11) is finite.*

In addition to Assumption (W) we will need the following assumption on the properties of the mapping ϕ in (3.22). For $p \geq 1$ put

$$0 < \underline{\mathrm{w}}_p := n^{1/p} \inf_{w\in\mathcal{V}} \|w\|_p \leq n^{1/p} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{V}} \|w\|_p =: \bar{\mathrm{w}}_p < \infty. \tag{3.24}$$

and define

$$\mathbb{Z}_p(b) := \big\{\zeta \in \mathbb{Z} : n^{1/p}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_p \leq b\big\}, \quad b \in [\underline{\mathrm{w}}_p, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_p]. \tag{3.25}$$

Assumption (L). *The mapping ϕ in (3.22) satisfies the following conditions:*

- *if $s \in [1,2)$ then*

$$\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_s(b)} \frac{n^{1/s}\big\|\phi[\zeta_1] - \phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_s}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)} \;\leq\; b, \qquad \forall b \in [\underline{\mathrm{w}}_s, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_s].$$

- *if $s \geq 2$ then*

$$\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_2(b)} \frac{\sqrt{n}\big\|\phi[\zeta_1] - \phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_2}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)} \;\leq\; b, \qquad \forall b \in [\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2]. \tag{3.26}$$

We note that Assumption (L) guarantees continuity of $\big\|\xi_w\big\|_s$ on $\phi[\mathbb{Z}]$ for any $s \leq 2$. The same property for $s > 2$ follows from Lemma 7. This, in view of Remark 2, replaces Assumption (A2).

The next statement presents the uniform moment bound on $\|\xi_w\|_s$ when $s \in [1,2]$, and $\mathcal{W}$ is given by (3.21).

Theorem 4. *Let the class of weights $\mathcal{W}$ be defined by (3.21), and let (3.22) and Assumptions (W1), (W4) and (L) hold.*

(i). *If $s \in [1,2)$ then for all $n \geq 1$, $z \geq [\sqrt{37}/2]\, n^{1/2-1/s}$, and $\epsilon \in (0,1]$ one has*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} \Big[\|\xi_w\|_s - 4u_\epsilon(1+z)n^{1/s}\|w\|_s\Big]_+^q \;\leq\; T_{3,\epsilon}\, n^{q/s} \exp\Big\{-\frac{2z^2}{37} n^{(2/s)-1}\Big\}.$$

(ii). *If $f \in \mathcal{F}$ then for all $n \geq 1$, $z \geq \sqrt{8[\mu_* \mathrm{f}_\infty^2 + 4n^{-1/2}]}$, and $\epsilon \in (0,1]$ one has*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} \Big[\|\xi_w\|_2 - u_\epsilon\Big(1+z+z^2/12\Big)\sqrt{n}\|w\|_2\Big]_+^q \leq T_{4,\epsilon}\, n^{q/2} \exp\Big\{-\frac{z^2}{16\big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\mu_* + 4n^{-1/2}\big]}\Big\}.$$

The explicit expressions for the constants $T_{3,\epsilon}$ and $T_{4,\epsilon}$ are given in the beginning of the proof of the theorem.

The bound of Theorem 4 is non–random because $U_\xi(w,f)$ does not depend on f whenever $s \in [1,2]$. The proof of this statement is based on application of Theorem 2.

Now we proceed with the case $s > 2$. Here we need the following notation. Given $p \geq 2$, let $m_p \in (0,1]$ be such that

$$\sup_{b\in[\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2,\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2]} b^{-1} \sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_2(b)} \frac{n^{1/p}\big\|\phi[\zeta_1] - \phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_p}{[\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{m_p}} =: C_p < \infty. \tag{3.27}$$

Existence of $m_p \in (0,1]$ such that (3.27) holds is ensured by Lemma 7 given in Section 8.2. In particular, it is shown there that if Assumptions (W) and (L) hold then m_p can be taken equal to $2/p$. We note also that $m_2 = 1$ and $C_2 = 1$ by Assumption (L).

Following (3.12)–(3.13) and Corollary 4 we set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}_\xi(w) &= c_1(s)\bigg\{\sqrt{n}\bigg\|\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} w^2(\cdot - X_i)\Big]^{1/2}\bigg\|_s + 2n^{1/s}\|w\|_s\bigg\}, \\ \breve{U}_\xi(w) &:= \max\{\hat{U}_\xi(w), \sqrt{n}\|w\|_2\}, \quad \bar{U}_\xi(w) := \max\{U_\xi(w,f), \sqrt{n}\|w\|_2\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

Put also

$$C^*_\xi(y) = 1 + 2\vartheta_0\Big\{\sqrt{y}\big[\mu_*^{1/s} + n^{-1/(2s)}\big] + yn^{-1/s}\Big\}, \quad m := \begin{cases} 1\wedge m_s, & s\in(2,4) \\ 1\wedge m_s \wedge m_{s/2}, & s \ge 4, \end{cases} \tag{3.29}$$

where $\vartheta_0 := 5c_1(s)[C_s \vee 1]\mathrm{f}_\infty \alpha_1^{-1}\alpha_2^{-1/2}$, α_1 and α_2 are given in Assumption (W2), and m_p and C_p are defined in (3.27).

THEOREM 5. *Let Assumptions (W) and (L) hold, and assume that* $f \in \mathcal{F}$. *Suppose that (W3) is fulfilled with* $\mu > [64c_1^2(s)]^{\frac{s\wedge 4}{s\wedge 4 - 1}}$, *and (W4) is fulfilled with* $\beta < m$. *Let* $\gamma = \mu^{1/(s\wedge 4) - 1/2}$, *and*

$$y_* := \begin{cases} \vartheta_1 n^{4/s-1}, & s\in(2,4), \\ \vartheta_2 \mu^{-1/2}\big[\mu_*^{2/s} + n^{-1/s}\big]^{-2}, & s \ge 4, \end{cases} \tag{3.30}$$

with constants ϑ_1 *and* ϑ_2 *specified explicitly in the proof; then for any* $s>2$ *and* $y \in [1, y^*]$ *one has*

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}\Big\{\|\xi_w\|_s - \bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)C^*_\xi(y)\breve{U}_\xi(w)\Big\}_+^q \le T_{5,\epsilon}\, n^{q/2}\big[C^*_\xi(y)\big]^q \exp\{-y/2\},$$

where $\bar{u}_\epsilon(\cdot)$ *is defined in Theorem 3. In addition, if* $\mathcal{W}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ *is an arbitrary subset of* $\mathcal{W}$ *then*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\breve{U}_\xi(w)\Big]^q \le \bigg\{\Big[1 + 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\mu^{\frac{1}{s\wedge 4} - \frac{1}{2}}\Big]\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\bar{U}_\xi(w)\bigg\}^q + T_{6,\epsilon}\, n^{\frac{q(s-2)}{2s}}\exp\{-y_*/2\}.$$

The explicit expressions for the constants $T_{5,\epsilon}$ *and* $T_{6,\epsilon}$ *are given in the proof.*

Theorem 5 establishes random uniform bounds on the norms of empirical processes in terms of the parameters determining the class $\mathcal{W}$. In particular, the parameters μ and μ_* play an important role. Theorem 5 leads to a number of powerful asymptotic results that demonstrate sharpness of the proposed random bound.

COROLLARY 5. *Let assumptions of Theorem 5 hold, and let* $s>2$ *be fixed. There exist positive constants* $k_i = k_i(s)$, $i=1,2,3$ *such that if*

$$\mu = \mu_n \asymp [\ln n]^{k_1}, \quad \mu_* = \mu_{*,n} \asymp [\ln n]^{-k_2}, \quad \epsilon = \epsilon_n \asymp [\ln n]^{-k_3}, \quad n\to\infty,$$

then for all $\ell > 0$ *and* $q \ge 1$

$$\begin{gathered} \limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} n^\ell\, \mathbb{E}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}\Big[\big\|\xi_w\big\|_s - (1+3\epsilon_n)\breve{U}_\xi(w)\Big]_+^q = 0, \\ \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\breve{U}_\xi(w)\Big]^q \le \Big[(1+\epsilon_n)\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\bar{U}_\xi(w,f)\Big]^q + R_n(\mathcal{W}_0), \end{gathered}$$

where $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\sup_{\mathcal{W}_0\subseteq\mathcal{W}}\big[n^\ell R_n(\mathcal{W}_0)\big] = 0.$

The explicit expressions for the constants $k_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ are easily computed from Theorem 5.

Remark 8. *Corollary 5 shows that if the class of weights $\mathcal{W}$ is such that $\mu = \mu_n$ and $\mu_* = \mu_{*,n}$, and if ϵ is set to be $\epsilon = \epsilon_n$, then $(1 + 3\epsilon_n)\breve{U}_n(w)$ is a uniform random bound on $\|\xi_w\|_s$ which is asymptotically almost as good as the non–random bound $\bar{U}_\xi(w, f)$ depending on f. Thus, in asymptotic terms, there is no loss in sharpness of the random uniform bound in comparison with the non–random bound that depends on f.*

3.4. *Specific problems.* In this section we consider process ξ_w corresponding to special classes of weights $\mathcal{W}$ that arise in kernel density estimation. Using results of Theorems 4 and 5 we derive uniform bounds on the norms of these processes. As in Section 3.3, here $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}^d$, and ν and τ are both the Lebesgue measure.

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a given set of real functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and suppose that $\mathcal{K}$ is a *totally bounded* set with respect to the $\mathbb{L}_\infty$–norm. Let $\mathcal{H} := \otimes_{i=1}^d [h_i^{\min}, h_i^{\max}]$, where the vectors $h^{\min} = (h_1^{\min}, \ldots, h_d^{\min})$, $h^{\max} = (h_1^{\max}, \ldots, h_d^{\max})$, $0 < h_i^{\min} \leq h_i^{\max} \leq 1$, $\forall i = 1, \ldots, d$ are fixed.

For any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ define $V_h := \prod_{i=1}^d h_i$, and endow the set $\mathcal{H}$ with the following distance:

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}\big(h, h'\big) = \max_{i=1,\ldots,d} \ln\left(\frac{h_i \vee h_i'}{h_i \wedge h_i'}\right). \tag{3.31}$$

In order to verify that $\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}$ is indeed a distance on $\mathcal{H}$ it suffices to note that the function $(x, y) \mapsto \ln(x \vee y) - \ln(x \wedge y)$, $x > 0, y > 0$ satisfies all the axioms of a distance on $\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}$.

We will be interested in the following classes of weights $\mathcal{W}$ and the corresponding processes ξ_w.

Kernel density estimator process. With any $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$ we associate the weight function

$$w(t - x) = n^{-1} K_h(t - x) := (nV_h)^{-1} K\big[(t - x)/h\big].$$

As before, u/v, $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, stands for the coordinate–wise division $(u_1/v_1, \ldots, u_d/v_d)$.

The weight w is naturally parametrized by K and h so that we put

$$\mathbb{Z}^{(1)} := \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H}, \ \ \zeta = (K, h), \ \ w = \phi_1[\zeta] := n^{-1} K_h. \tag{3.32}$$

We equip $\mathbb{Z}^{(1)}$ with the family of distances $\{\mathrm{d}_\vartheta^{(1)}(\cdot, \cdot), \vartheta > 0\}$ defined by

$$\mathrm{d}_\vartheta^{(1)}(\zeta, \zeta') = \vartheta \max\left\{\big\|K - K'\big\|_\infty, \ \Delta_{\mathcal{H}}\big(h, h'\big)\right\}, \ \ \zeta = (K, h), \ \zeta' = \big(K', h'\big), \ \vartheta > 0.$$

Obviously, $\mathbb{Z}^{(1)}$ is a totally bounded set with respect to $\mathrm{d}_\vartheta^{(1)}$ for any $\vartheta > 0$.

The corresponding family of random fields is

$$\xi_w^{(1)}(t) := \xi_{\phi_1[\zeta]}(t) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \Big\{K_h\big(t - X_i\big) - \mathbb{E}K_h\big(t - X\big)\Big\}, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}, \tag{3.33}$$

and we are interested in bounds on the $\mathbb{L}_s$–norm of this process uniform over the class of weights

$$\mathcal{W}^{(1)} := \Big\{w(\cdot - \cdot) = n^{-1} K_h(\cdot - \cdot) : (K, h) \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}\Big\}.$$

We note that $\xi_w^{(1)}$ is the stochastic error of the kernel density estimator associated with the kernel $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and bandwidth $h \in \mathcal{H}$. According to Theorems 4 and 5, for the process $\{\xi_w, w \in \mathcal{W}^{(1)}\}$ the uniform bounds on $\|\xi_w\|_s$ should be based on the following functionals. Define

$$U_\xi^{(1)}(w) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} 4(nh)^{1/s-1}\|K\|_s, & s \in [1,2), \\ (nh)^{-1/2}\, \|K\|_2, & s = 2. \end{cases}$$

For $s > 2$ we put

$$U_\xi^{(1)}(w,f) := c_1(s)\Big[n^{-1/2}\Big(\int\Big[\int K_h^2(t-x)f(x)\mathrm{d}x\Big]^{s/2}\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{1/s} + 2(nh)^{1/s-1}\|K\|_s\Big],$$

$$\hat{U}_\xi^{(1)}(w) := c_1(s)\Big[n^{-1/2}\Big(\int\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n K_h^2(t-X_i)\Big]^{s/2}\mathrm{d}t\Big)^{1/s} + 2(nh)^{1/s-1}\|K\|_s\Big],$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_\xi^{(1)}(w,f) \quad &:= \quad \max\big[U_\xi^{(1)}(w,f),\, (nh)^{-1/2}\|K\|_2\big] \\ \breve{U}_\xi^{(1)}(w) \quad &:= \quad \max\big[\hat{U}_\xi^{(1)}(w),\, (nh)^{-1/2}\|K\|_2\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Convolution kernel density estimator process. For any $(K,h) \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}$ and $(Q,\mathfrak{h}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}$ we define

$$w(t-x) = n^{-1}\big[K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\big](t-x), \tag{3.35}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}^{(1)}$ is defined in (3.32), and $*$ stands for the convolution on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Put

$$\mathbb{Z}^{(2)} := \mathbb{Z}^{(1)} \times \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}, \quad z = \big[(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})\big], \quad w = \phi_2[z] = n^{-1}(K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}),$$

and define the family of distances on $\mathbb{Z}^{(2)}$ as

$$\mathrm{d}_\vartheta^{(2)}(z,z') = \vartheta \max\Big\{\|K-K'\|_\infty \vee \|Q-Q'\|_\infty,\ \Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(h,h') \vee \Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}')\Big\}, \quad \vartheta > 0,$$

where $z = \big[(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})\big]$, $z' = \big[(K',h'),(Q',\mathfrak{h}')\big]$, $z, z' \in \mathbb{Z}^{(2)}$. Obviously, $\mathbb{Z}^{(2)}$ is a totally bounded set with respect to the distance $\mathrm{d}_\vartheta^{(2)}$ for any $\vartheta > 0$.

The corresponding family of random fields is

$$\xi_w^{(2)}(t) := \xi_{\phi_2[z]}(t) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \Big\{\big[K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\big]\big(t-X_i\big) - \mathbb{E}\big[K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\big]\big(t-X\big)\Big\}, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}^{(2)}, \tag{3.36}$$

and we are interested in a uniform bound on $\big\|\xi_w^{(2)}\big\|_s$ over

$$\mathcal{W}^{(2)} := \Big\{w(\cdot-\cdot) = n^{-1}K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}(\cdot-\cdot),\ \ [(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})] \in \mathbb{Z}^{(2)}\Big\}.$$

The random field ξ_w with w given by (3.35) appears in the context of multivariate density estimation. In particular, the uniform bounds on $\|\xi_w\|_s$ are instrumental in construction of a selection rule for the family of kernel estimators parametrized by $\mathcal{K}\times\mathcal{H}$ [see Goldenshluger and Lepski (2009)]. Theorems 4 and 5 suggest to base the uniform bounds on the following quantities. Define

$$U_\xi^{(2)}(w) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} 4n^{1/s-1}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_s, & s\in[1,2),\\ n^{-1/2}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_2, & s=2. \end{cases}$$

For $s>2$ we put

$$U_\xi^{(2)}(w,f) := c_1(s)\bigg[n^{-1/2}\bigg(\int\bigg[\int[K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}]^2(t-x)f(x)\mathrm{d}x\bigg]^{s/2}\mathrm{d}t\bigg)^{1/s} + 2n^{1/s-1}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_s\bigg],$$

$$\hat{U}_\xi^{(2)}(w) := c_1(s)\bigg[n^{-1/2}\bigg(\int\bigg[n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n[K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}]^2(t-X_i)\bigg]^{s/2}\mathrm{d}t\bigg)^{1/s} + 2n^{1/s-1}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_s\bigg];$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_\xi^{(2)}(w,f) \quad &:= \quad \max\big[U_\xi^{(2)}(w,f),\, n^{-1/2}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_2\big],\\ \breve{U}_\xi^{(2)}(w) \quad &:= \quad \max\big[\hat{U}_\xi^{(2)}(w),\, n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_2\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

Theorems 4 and 5 can be used in order to establish upper bounds on the norms of the processes $\xi_w^{(i)}$, $i=1,2$. For this purpose, Assumptions (W) and (L) should be verified for the classes of weights $\mathcal{W}^{(i)}$, $i=1,2$ defined above. To this end we introduce conditions on the family of kernels $\mathcal{K}$ that imply Assumptions (W) and (L). These conditions are rather natural and easily verifiable; they can be weakened in several ways, but we do not pursue this issue here and try to minimize cumbersome calculations to be done.

Assumption (K) .

(K1) *The family $\mathcal{K}$ is a subset of the isotropic Hölder ball of functions $\mathbb{H}_d(1, L_{\mathcal{K}})$ with the exponent 1 and the Lipschitz constant $L_{\mathcal{K}}$, i.e.,*

$$|K(x)-K(y)| \le L_{\mathcal{K}}|x-y|, \quad \forall x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean distance. Moreover, any function K from $\mathcal{K}$ is compactly supported and, without loss of generality, $\mathrm{supp}(K)\subseteq[-1/2,1/2]^d$ *for all $K\in\mathcal{K}$.*

(K2) *There exist real numbers $\mathrm{k}_1>0$ and $\mathrm{k}_\infty<\infty$ such that*

$$\mathrm{k}_1 \le \bigg|\int K(t)\mathrm{d}t\bigg| \le \|K\|_\infty \le \mathrm{k}_\infty, \quad \forall K\in\mathcal{K}.$$

Without loss of generality we will assume that $\mathrm{k}_\infty\ge 1$ and $\mathrm{k}_1\le 1$.

(K3) *The set $\mathcal{K}$ is a totally bounded set with respect to the $\mathbb{L}_\infty$–norm, and there exists a real number $\beta_{\mathcal{K}}\in(0,1)$ such that the entropy $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot)$ of $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{\delta\in(0,1)}\big[\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{K}}(\delta)-\delta^{-\beta_{\mathcal{K}}}\big] =: C_{\mathcal{K}}<\infty.$$

Several remarks on the above assumptions are in order. First we note that Assumptions (K1) and (K3) are not completely independent. In fact, if we suppose that $\mathcal{K}\subset\mathbb{H}_d(\alpha, L_{\mathcal{K}})$ with some $\alpha>d$ then Assumption (K3) is automatically fulfilled with $\beta_{\mathcal{K}}=\alpha/d$. On the other hand, all our results remain valid if $\mathcal{K}\subset\mathbb{H}_d(\alpha, L_{\mathcal{K}})$ with some $\alpha>0$. Observe also that the condition $|\int K(t)\mathrm{d}t|\ge \mathrm{k}_1$ of Assumption (K2) is not restrictive at all because for kernel estimators $\int K(t)\mathrm{d}t=1$. Therefore the first inequality in (K2) is satisfied with $\mathrm{k}_1=1$.

Remark 9. *It is easy to check that Assumption (K1) implies Assumption (A2) in Section 3.2 and Assumption 2 in Section 2.*

Now we apply Theorems 4 and 5 to the families of random fields given by (3.33) and (3.36). We present the results for the processes $\{\xi_{\phi_1[\zeta]}, \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\xi_{\phi_2[z]}, z \in \mathbb{Z}^{(2)}\}$ in a unified way.

3.4.1. *Case $s \in [1,2]$. Uniform non-random bounds.* In order to derive the uniform upper bounds for $s \in [1,2]$ we use Theorem 4. Obviously, Assumption (K) implies Assumptions (W1) and (W4). Thus in order to apply Theorem 4 we need to verify Assumption (L). This is done in Lemma 9 given in Section 9. Thus Theorem 4 is directly applicable, and non–asymptotic bounds can be straightforwardly derived from this theorem; one needs only to recalculate the constants appearing in the statements of the theorem.

We note that the quantity μ_* defined in (3.23) satisfies $\mu_* \le 2^d V_{h^{\max}}$ for the set of weights $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ and $\mu_* \le 4^d V_{h^{\max}}$ for the set of weights $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$. If we assume that $V_{h^{\max}} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ then we can establish some asymptotic results, one of which is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 6. *If Assumption (K) holds then for all $s \in [1,2)$, $\ell > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{\ell} \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{(i)}} \Big[\|\xi_w^{(i)}\|_s - (1+\epsilon) U_\xi^{(i)}(w)\Big]_+^q = 0, \quad i=1,2.$$

If Assumption (K) holds and $V_{h^{\max}} = o(1/\ln n)$ as $n \to \infty$ then for all $\ell > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{\ell} \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{(i)}} \Big[\|\xi_w^{(i)}\|_2 - (1+\epsilon) U_\xi^{(i)}(w)\Big]_+^q = 0, \quad i=1,2.$$

Proof of the theorem is omitted; it is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 4 and Lemma 9 given below in Section 9.

3.4.2. *Case $s > 2$. Uniform random bounds.* In the case $s > 2$ the uniform bounds are derived from Theorem 5. To state these results we need the following notation. Define

$$\vartheta_0^{(1)} := 10 c_1(s) \mathrm{f}_\infty \Big[L_{\mathcal{K}} \sqrt{d}/\mathrm{k}_1\Big]^{d/2}, \quad \vartheta_0^{(2)} := 10 c_1(s) \mathrm{f}_\infty \Big[2^{d+2}\sqrt{d} L_{\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{k}_\infty/\mathrm{k}_1^2\Big]^{d/2}. \tag{3.38}$$

The next two quantities, $A_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $B_{\mathcal{H}}$, are completely determined by the bandwidth set $\mathcal{H}$:

$$A_{\mathcal{H}} := \prod_{j=1}^{d} \ln\Big(h_j^{\max}/h_j^{\min}\Big), \quad B_{\mathcal{H}} := \log_2\Big(V_{h^{\max}}/V_{h^{\min}}\Big) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \log_2\Big(h_j^{\max}/h_j^{\min}\Big). \tag{3.39}$$

For $y > 0$ put

$$C_{\xi,i}^*(y) := 1 + 2\vartheta_0^{(i)} \Big\{\sqrt{y}\Big(\big[2^{di} V_{h^{\max}}\big]^{1/s} + n^{-1/2s}\Big) + y n^{-1/s}\Big\}, \quad i=1,2. \tag{3.40}$$

Define also

$$y_*^{(i)} := \begin{cases} \vartheta_1^{(i)} n^{4/s-1}, & s \in (2,4), \\ \vartheta_2^{(i)} (nV_{h^{\min}})^{-1/2} \Big[(2^{di} V_{h^{\max}})^{2/s} + n^{-1/s}\Big]^{-2}, & s > 4, \end{cases}$$

where explicit expressions for the constants $\vartheta_1^{(i)}, \vartheta_2^{(i)}$, $i=1,2$ are given in the proof of Theorem 7.

Theorem 7. *Let Assumption (K) hold, $f\in\mathcal{F}$, and let $\max_{j=1,\dots,d}|h_j^{\max}|\le 1$. For $i=1,2$ assume that*

$$nV_{h^{\min}} > \Big[64c_1^2(s)\Big]^{\frac{s\wedge4}{s\wedge4-1}}\Big[2^{d+2}\sqrt{d}L_{\mathcal{K}}\mathrm{k}_\infty/\mathrm{k}_1^2\Big]^{d(i-1)}. \tag{3.41}$$

If $\gamma := (nV_{h^{\min}})^{1/(s\wedge4)-1/2}$ then for any $s>2$, $y\in\big[1,y_*^{(i)}\big]$ and for $i=1,2$ one has

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{(i)}}\Big\{\Big\|\xi_w^{(i)}\Big\|_s-\bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)C^*_{\xi,i}(y)\breve{U}^{(i)}_\xi(w)\Big\}_+^q \;\le\; \tilde{T}^{(i)}_{1,\epsilon}(1+A_{\mathcal{H}})^{2i}(1+B_{\mathcal{H}})n^{q/2}\big[C^*_{\xi,i}(y)\big]^q e^{-y/2},$$

where $\bar{u}_\epsilon(\cdot)$ is defined in Theorem 3, and $\breve{U}^{(i)}_\xi(w)$ are defined in (3.34) and (3.37).

In addition, for any subset $\mathcal{W}_0\subseteq\mathcal{W}^{(i)}$, any $s>2$ and for $i=1,2$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\breve{U}^{(i)}_\xi(w)\Big]^q \;\;\le\;\; &\Big[1+4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\Big(nV_{h^{\min}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{s\wedge4}-\frac{1}{2}}\Big]^q\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\Big\{\bar{U}^{(i)}_\xi(w)\Big\}^q\\ &+\;\tilde{T}^{(i)}_{2,\epsilon}\,(1+A_{\mathcal{H}})^{2i}(1+B_{\mathcal{H}})n^{\frac{q(s-2)}{2s}}\exp\Big\{-y_*^{(i)}/2\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

The explicit expressions for the constants $\tilde{T}^{(i)}_{1,\epsilon}$ and $\tilde{T}^{(i)}_{2,\epsilon}$ are given in the proof.

We emphasize that the upper bounds of Theorem 7 are non–asymptotic. The constants $\vartheta_1^{(i)}$, $\vartheta_2^{(i)}$, $\tilde{T}_1^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{T}_2^{(i)}$ are written down explicitly in the proof of the theorem; they are completely determined through the quantities $L_{\mathcal{K}}$, k_1, k_∞, $C_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{K}}$ appearing in Assumption (K), and the constant $c_1(s)$ in the Rosenthal inequality.

Remark 10. *The condition (3.41) is not restrictive because the standard assumption on the bandwidth set $\mathcal{H}$ in the kernel density estimation is that*

$$nV_{h^{\min}}\to\infty,\quad V_{h^{\max}}\to0,\;\; n\to\infty.$$

The bounds established in Theorem 7 can be used in order to derive asymptotic (as $n\to\infty$) results under general assumptions on the set of bandwidths $\mathcal{H}$. One of such results is given in the next corollary.

Corollary 6. *Let $s>2$ be fixed, Assumption (K) hold, and $f\in\mathcal{F}$. There exist positive constants $k_{1,i}=k_{1,i}(s)$, $k_{2,i}=k_{2,i}(s)$, and $k_{3,i}=k_{3,i}(s)$, $i=1,2$ such that if*

$$V_{h^{\max}}\;\asymp\;\Big[\ln n\Big]^{-k_{1,i}},\quad nV_{h^{\min}}\;\asymp\;\Big[\ln n\Big]^{k_{2,i}},\quad \epsilon=\epsilon_n\asymp[\ln n]^{-k_{3,i}},\quad n\to\infty.$$

then for all $\ell>0$, $q\ge1$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}n^\ell\,\mathbb{E}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{(i)}}\Big[\big\|\xi_w^{(i)}\big\|_s-(1+3\epsilon_n)\breve{U}^{(i)}_\xi(w)\Big]_+^q=0.$$

In addition, for any subset $\mathcal{W}_0\in\mathcal{W}^{(i)}$ one has

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\breve{U}^{(i)}_\xi(w)\Big]^q\le\Big[(1+\epsilon_n)\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}_0}\bar{U}^{(i)}_\xi(w,f)\Big]^q+R_n^{(i)}(\mathcal{W}_0),$$

where $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\sup_{\mathcal{W}_0\subseteq\mathcal{W}^{(i)}}[n^\ell R_n^{(i)}(\mathcal{W}_0)]=0$, $i=1,2$.

We remark that explicit expressions for the constants $k_{1,i}$ and $k_{2,i}$, $i=1,2$ are easily derived from Theorem 7.

4. Uniform bounds for norms of regression–type processes. In this section we use Proposition 2 in order to derive uniform bounds for the family $\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$. First we check Assumption 1 by establishing an analogue of Theorem 1 for a fixed weight function $w \in \mathcal{W}$ [see Theorem 8 below]. It turns out that the corresponding inequality depends heavily on the tail probability of random variable ε. In other words, we prove that Assumption 1 is fulfilled with a function g that is determined by the rate at which the tail probability of ε decreases. Next, under Assumptions (W) and (L), we derive uniform bounds using Corollary 1; this leads to an analogue of Theorem 4 for the regression–type processes.

4.1. *Probability bounds for fixed weight function.* We consider two types of moment conditions on the distribution of ε.

Assumption (E). *The distribution of ε is symmetric, and one of the following two conditions is fulfilled*

(E1) *there exist constants $\alpha > 0$, $v > 0$ and $b > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{|\varepsilon| \geq x\big\} \leq v \exp\{-bx^{\alpha}\}, \quad \forall x > 0,$$

(E2) *there exist constants $p \geq [s \vee 2]$ and $P > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}|\varepsilon|^p \leq P.$$

Let $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 := \mathbb{E}\varepsilon^2$ and $e_s := (\mathbb{E}|\varepsilon|^s)^{1/s}$. For any $w \in \mathcal{W}$ define

$$\varrho_s(w,f) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} \sigma_\varepsilon \Big\{\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f) \wedge 4n^{1/s}M_s(w)\Big\}, & s < 2, \\ \sigma_\varepsilon \sqrt{n}\, M_2(w), & s = 2, \\ c_1(s)\big[\sigma_\varepsilon \sqrt{n}\,\Sigma_s(w,f) + 2n^{1/s}\, e_s M_s(w)\big], & s > 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\varpi_s^2(w,f) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} M_s^2(w)\big[(6\sigma_\varepsilon^2 + 8)n + 96\sigma_\varepsilon n^{1/s}\big], & s < 2, \\ 6\sigma_\varepsilon^2 n M^2_{1,\tau,\nu'}(w) + 24\sigma_\varepsilon \sqrt{n} M_2^2(w) & s = 2, \end{cases}$$

and if $s > 2$ then we set

$$\varpi_s^2(w,f) := 6c_3(s)\Big[\sigma_\varepsilon^2 n M^2_{\frac{2s}{s+2},\tau,\nu'}(w) + 4\sigma_\varepsilon\sqrt{n}\,\Sigma_s(w,f)M_s(w) + 8e_s n^{1/s} M_s^2(w)\Big].$$

In the above formulas we use notation introduced in the beginning of Section 3; the formulas should be compared with (3.3) and (3.4).

The next theorem is the analogue of Theorem 1 for the regression–type processes.

Theorem 8. (i). *Suppose that Assumption (E1) holds, and for $x > 0$ define the function*

$$G_1(x) := (1+nv)g_{\alpha,b}(x), \quad g_{\alpha,b}(x) := \begin{cases} \exp\Big\{-|x| \wedge |b^{1/\alpha}x|^{\alpha/(2+\alpha)}\Big\}, & s < 2, \\ \exp\Big\{-|x| \wedge |b^{1/\alpha}x|^{\alpha/(1+\alpha)}\Big\}, & s \geq 2. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Then for all $s \in [1,\infty)$ and $z > 0$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau} \geq \varrho_s(w,f) + z\big\} \leq G_1\left(\frac{z^2}{\frac{1}{3}\varpi_s^2(w,f) + \frac{4}{3}c_*(s)M_s(w)z}\right),$$

where $c_*(\cdot)$ is given in (3.2).

(ii). *Suppose that Assumption (E2) holds and for $x>0$ define the function*

$$G_2(x)=(1+nP)\times\begin{cases}\big(x^{-1}p\ln\big[1+p^{-1}x\big]\big)^{p/2}, & s<2,\\ \big(x^{-1}p\ln\big[1+p^{-1}x\big]\big)^{p}, & s\geq 2.\end{cases}$$

Then for all $s\in[1,\infty)$ and $z>0$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}\geq\varrho_s(w)+z\right\}\leq G_2\left(\frac{z^2}{\frac{1}{3}\varpi_s^2(w,f)+\frac{4}{3}c_*(s)M_s(w)z}\right).$$

4.2. *Uniform bound.* Theorem 8 guarantees that Assumption 1 holds with function g being either G_1 or G_2. This result is the basis for derivation of uniform bounds, and the general machinery presented in the previous sections can be fully applied here. In this section we restrict ourselves only with uniform bounds over the classes of weights depending on the difference of arguments. In other words, under Assumptions (W), (L) and (E1) we prove an analogue of Theorem 4 for the regression–type processes.

A natural assumption in the regression model where the process $\{\eta_w, w\in\mathcal{W}\}$ appears is that the design variable X is distributed on a bounded interval of $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., the density f is compactly supported. This will be assumed throughtout this section.

Let $\mathcal{I}\in\mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded interval, $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{I}$, and let $\tau=\nu=\mathrm{mes}$ be the Lebesgue measure. For the sake of brevity we write $\alpha_*=\alpha_1^{-1}\alpha_2^{-1/2}$ where α_1 and α_2 appear in Assumption (W2). Define

$$\mathrm{a}:=\max\Big(\sigma_\varepsilon\sqrt{\mathrm{mes}(\mathcal{I})},\ c_1(s)\big[\sigma_\varepsilon\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2e_s\alpha_*\big]\Big),\quad \mathrm{c}_n:=\frac{4}{3}c_*(s)\alpha_*n^{-1/s};$$

$$\mathrm{b}_n^2:=\begin{cases}\big[2\sigma_\varepsilon^2+\frac{8}{3}+32\sigma_\varepsilon n^{1/s-1}\big]\mu_*^{2/s-1}, & s<2,\\ 2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\mu_*+8n^{-1/2} & s=2,\\ 2c_3(s)\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\big[\sigma_\varepsilon^2\mu_*^{2/s}+\big(4\sigma_\varepsilon\alpha_*+8e_s\alpha_*^2\big)n^{-1/s}\big], & s>2.\end{cases}$$

Theorem 9. *Let Assumption (W) holds, $f\in\mathcal{F}$, and assume that (3.26) is valid for all $s\geq 1$. Let Assumption (W5) be fulfilled with $\beta<\alpha/(2+\alpha)$, if $s<2$, and with $\beta<\alpha/(1+\alpha)$ if $s\geq 2$. Then for all $s\geq 1$, $q\geq 1$ and $y>1$ one has*

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}\Big[\|\eta_w\|_s-\mathrm{a}u_\epsilon\big(1+2\sqrt{y}\mathrm{b}_n+2y\mathrm{c}_n\big)\sqrt{n}\|w\|_2\Big]_+^q\leq T_{n,\epsilon}\big[1+2\sqrt{y}\mathrm{b}_n+2y\mathrm{c}_n\big]^q\big[g_{\alpha,b}(y)\big]^{1/4},$$

where $u_\epsilon=2^\epsilon(1+\epsilon)$, $g_{\alpha,b}(\cdot)$ is defined in (4.1), and the explicit expression of the constant $T_{n,\epsilon}$ is given in the beginning of the proof of the theorem.

The following asymptotic result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 9.

Corollary 7. *Let assumptions of Theorem 9 hold. For any $\alpha>0$ there exist a universal constant $\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{c}(\alpha)>0$ such that if $\mu_*\asymp[\ln n]^{-\mathrm{c}}$ then for all $s\geq 1$, $\epsilon\in(0,1)$ and for all $\ell>0$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}n^\ell\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\mathbb{E}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}\Big[\big\|\eta_w\big\|_s-(1+\epsilon)\mathrm{a}\sqrt{n}\|w\|_2\Big]_+^q=0.$$

The explicit expression for $\mathrm{c}(\alpha)$ is easily derived from Theorem 9.

5. Proofs of Propositions 1 and 2.

5.1. *Proof of Proposition 1.* Let Z_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be an $\epsilon 2^{-k-3}$-net of Z, and let $z_k(\zeta)$, $\zeta \in Z$ denote the element of Z_k closest to ζ (in the metric d) .

The continuity of the mapping $\zeta \mapsto \xi_{\phi[\zeta]}$ guarantees that P-almost surely the following relation holds for any $\zeta \in Z$:

$$\xi_{\phi[\zeta]} = \xi_{\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[\xi_{\phi[z_{k+1}(\zeta)]} - \xi_{\phi[z_k(\zeta)]}\right], \tag{5.1}$$

where $\zeta^{(0)}$ is an arbitrary fixed element of Z and $z_0(\zeta) = \zeta^{(0)}$, $\forall \zeta \in Z$.

Note also that independently of ζ for all $k \geq 0$

$$\mathrm{d}\big(z_{k+1}(\zeta), z_k(\zeta)\big) \leq \epsilon 2^{-k-2}. \tag{5.2}$$

We get from sub-additivity of Ψ, (5.1) and (5.2) that for any $\zeta \in Z$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big) &\leq \Psi\Big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]}\Big) + \frac{\pi^2}{6} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k \Psi\Big(\xi_{\phi[z_{k+1}(\phi)]} - \xi_{\phi[z_k(\phi)]}\Big)(k+1)^2 \\ &\leq \Psi\left(\xi_{\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]}\right) + \frac{\pi^2}{6} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{\substack{(z,z') \in Z_{k+1} \times Z_k: \\ \mathrm{d}(z,z') \leq \epsilon 2^{-k-2}}} (k+1)^2 \Psi\left(\xi_{\phi[z]} - \xi_{\phi[z']}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where $p_k := 6/(\pi^2(k+1)^2)$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k = 1$. Since $\xi_{\bullet}$ is linear, $\xi_{\phi[z]} - \xi_{\phi[z']} = \xi_{\phi[z]-\phi[z']}$ for all $z, z' \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we obtain from (5.3) and the triangle inequality for probabilities that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}\Big\{\sup_{\zeta \in Z} \Psi\left(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\right) \geq (1+\epsilon)\left[\varkappa_U(Z) + C^*(y,Z)\right]\Big\} \;&\leq\; \mathrm{P}\Big\{\Psi\left(\xi_{\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]}\right) \geq \varkappa_U(Z) + C^*(y,Z)\Big\} \\ + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{(z,z') \in Z_{k+1} \times Z_k: \\ \mathrm{d}(z,z') \leq \epsilon 2^{-k-2}}} &\mathrm{P}\bigg\{\Psi\left(\xi_{\phi[z]-\phi[z']}\right) \geq \frac{6\epsilon\big[\varkappa_U(Z) + C^*(y,Z)\big]}{\pi^2(k+1)^2}\bigg\} =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

In view of (2.1) and because $\zeta^{(0)} \in Z$ we have that $U\big(\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]\big) \leq \varkappa_U(Z)$. Therefore, we get from Assumption 1(i) and monotonicity of the function g that for any $y > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \mathrm{P}\left\{\Psi\left(\xi_{\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]}\right) - U(\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]) \geq C^*(y,Z)\right\} \\ &\leq g\bigg(\frac{\big[C^*(y,Z)\big]^2}{A^2\left(\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]\right) + B\left(\phi[\zeta^{(0)}]\right) C^*(y,Z)}\bigg) \leq g\bigg(\frac{\big[C^*(y,Z)\big]^2}{\Lambda_A^2(Z) + \Lambda_B(Z) C^*(y,Z)}\bigg) \leq g(y). \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

To order to get the last inequality we have used monotonicity of g and that for any $y > 0$

$$\frac{\big[C^*(y,Z)\big]^2}{\Lambda_A^2(Z) + \Lambda_B(Z) C^*(y,Z)} = \frac{[\sqrt{y}\Lambda_A(Z) + y\Lambda_B(Z)]^2}{\Lambda_A^2(Z) + \Lambda_B(Z)[\sqrt{y}\Lambda_A(Z) + y\Lambda_B(Z)]} \geq y.$$

By (2.1), if $z, z' \in Z$ and $\mathrm{d}(z,z') \leq \epsilon 2^{-k-2}$ then

$$U\big(\phi[z] - \phi[z']\big) \leq \epsilon 2^{-k-2} \varkappa_U(Z),$$

and, therefore, for any $y \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{P}\Big\{\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[z]-\phi[z']}\big) \geq \frac{6\epsilon\big[\varkappa_U(Z)+C^*(y,Z)\big]}{\pi^2(k+1)^2}\Big\} \\
&\leq \;\mathrm{P}\Big\{\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[z]-\phi[z']}\big) - U\big(\phi[z]-\phi[z']\big) \geq \frac{6\epsilon\big[\varkappa_U(Z)+C^*(y,Z)\big]}{\pi^2(k+1)^2} - \varkappa_U(Z)\,\epsilon 2^{-k-2}\Big\} \\
&\leq \;\mathrm{P}\Big\{\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[z]-\phi[z']}\big) - U\big(\phi[z]-\phi[z']\big) \geq \frac{9\epsilon C^*(y,Z)}{16(k+1)^2}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we took into account that $\min_{k\geq 0}\big[6\pi^{-2}(k+1)^{-2} - 2^{-k-2}\big] > 0$, and $9/16 < (6/\pi^2)$. Putting $C_k = \frac{9\epsilon C^*(y,Z)}{16(k+1)^2}$ and applying Assumption 1(i) we obtain for any $z, z' \in Z_{k+1} \times Z_k$ satisfying $\mathrm{d}(z,z') \leq \epsilon 2^{-k-2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{P}\Big\{\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[z]-\phi[z']}\big) \geq \frac{6\epsilon\big[\varkappa_U(Z)+C^*(y,Z)\big]}{\pi^2(k+1)^2}\Big\} \\
&\leq \; g\bigg(\frac{C_k^2}{A^2\left(\phi[z]-\phi[z']\right) + B\left(\phi[z]-\phi[z']\right)C_k}\bigg) \\
&\leq \; g\bigg(\frac{C_k^2}{\big[\Lambda_A\left(Z\right)\epsilon 2^{-k-2}\big]^2 + \big[\Lambda_B\left(Z\right)\epsilon 2^{-k-2}\big]C_k}\bigg) \leq g\bigg(\frac{\tilde{C}_k^2}{\Lambda_A^2\left(Z\right) + \Lambda_B\left(Z\right)\tilde{C}_k}\bigg),
\end{aligned}$$

where we denoted $\tilde{C}_k = C_k 2^{k+2}$. Taking into account that $9(k+1)^{-2}2^{k-2} \geq 1$ for any $k \geq 0$, and by definition of $C^*(y,Z)$ we obtain for any $y > 0$ that

$$\frac{\tilde{C}_k^2}{\Lambda_A^2\left(Z\right) + \Lambda_B\left(Z\right)\tilde{C}_k} \;\geq\; 9y(k+1)^{-2}2^{k-2}.$$

Hence, we obtain for any $z, z' \in Z_{k+1} \times Z_k$ satisfying $\mathrm{d}(z,z') \leq \epsilon 2^{-k-2}$:

$$\mathrm{P}\Big\{\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[z]-\phi[z']}\big) \geq \frac{6\epsilon\big[\varkappa_U(Z)+C^*(y,Z)\big]}{\pi^2(k+1)^2}\Big\} \leq g\big(9y\; 2^{k-2}(k+1)^{-2}\big). \tag{5.6}$$

Noting that the right hand side of (5.6) does not depend on z, z' we get

$$I_2 \;\;\leq\;\; \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\Big\{N_{Z,\mathrm{d}}\big(\epsilon 2^{-k-1}\big)\Big\}^2 g\left(9y\; 2^{k-2}(k+1)^{-2}\right). \tag{5.7}$$

The theorem statement follows now from (5.4), (5.5) and (5.7). ∎

5.2. *Proof of Proposition 2.* Let Z_l, $l = 1, \dots, N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)$ be d–balls of the radius $\epsilon/8$ forming a minimal covering of the set $\mathbb{Z}$. For any $0 \leq j \leq \epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r) - 1$ (without loss of generality we assume that $\epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r)$ is integer), let $\delta_j = r2^{\epsilon j}$, and put

$$\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}} = \big\{\zeta \in \mathbb{Z} : \delta_j < U\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) \leq \delta_{j+1}\big\}.$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_j} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}$ for all j because $\epsilon \in (0,1]$; recall that $\mathbb{Z}_a$ is defined in (2.6).

We have $Z_l = \cup_{j=0}^{\log_2(R/r)-1}\big\{Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big\}$ for any $l = 1, \dots, N_{Z,\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)$. Therefore for any $y > 0$

$$\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, Z_l) \le \sup_{j=0,\dots,\log_2(R/r)-1} \Big[\sup_{\zeta \in Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}} \Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big) - u_\epsilon C^*(y)\delta_j \Big]. \tag{5.8}$$

Let $0 \le j \le \epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r) - 1$ be fixed; then using the definition of Λ_A and Λ_B [see (2.2)–(2.3)] and the fact that $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j+1}}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} C^*(y) &\ge 1 + \delta_{j+1}^{-1}\big[2\sqrt{y}\Lambda_A(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j+1}}) + 2y\Lambda_B(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j+1}})\big] \\ &\ge 1 + \delta_j^{-1}\big[\sqrt{y}\Lambda_A(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j+1}}) + y\Lambda_B(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j+1}})\big] \\ &\ge 1 + \delta_j^{-1}\big[\sqrt{y}\Lambda_A\big(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big) + y\Lambda_B\big(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big)\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$C^*(y)\delta_j \ge \delta_j + \big[\sqrt{y}\Lambda_A\big(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big) + y\Lambda_B\big(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big)\big] \ge 2^{-\epsilon}\varkappa_U\big(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big) + C^*\big(y, \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big),$$

since by the premise of the proposition $\delta_j = 2^{-\epsilon}\delta_{j+1} \ge 2^{-\epsilon}\varkappa_U(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j+1}}) \ge 2^{-\epsilon}\varkappa_U\big(\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big)$. Note also that the definition of $C^*\big(\cdot,\cdot\big)$ implies that $C^*\big(\cdot, Z_1\big) \le C^*\big(\cdot, Z_2\big)$ whenever $Z_1 \subseteq Z_2$. Thus we have for any $0 \le j \le \epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r) - 1$ and any $l = 1, \dots, N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)$

$$u_\epsilon C^*(y)\delta_j \ \ge\ (1+\epsilon)\Big[\varkappa_U\big(Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big) + C^*\big(y, Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big)\Big]. \tag{5.9}$$

Taking into account (5.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{P}\left\{\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, Z_l) \ge 0\right\} \\ &\le \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(R/r)-1} \mathrm{P}\Big\{ \sup_{\zeta \in Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}} \Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big) \ge (1+\epsilon)\Big[\varkappa_U\big(Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big) + C^*\big(y, Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}\big)\Big]\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 1 for the sets $Z_l \cap \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}$ we get for any $y > 0$

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, Z_l) \ge 0\right\} \ \le \ \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(R/r)-1} L^{(\epsilon)}_{g,\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j+1}}}(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(R/r)-1} L^{(\epsilon)}_g\Big(y, r2^{\epsilon(j+1)}\Big).$$

It remains to note that the right hand side of the last inequality does not depend on l; thus we come to the first assertion of the proposition.

Now we derive the bound for the moments of $\Psi^*_{u_\epsilon}(y, \mathbb{Z})$. We have from (5.8) with $y > 0$ that for any $q \ge 1$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{E}\left(\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big) - u_\epsilon C^*(y)U(\phi[\zeta])\Big\}\right)_+^q \\ &\le \sum_{l=1}^{N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)} \sum_{j=0}^{\epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r)-1} \mathrm{E}\left(\sup_{\zeta\in Z_l\cap\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}}\Big\{\Psi\left(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\right) - u_\epsilon C^*(y)\delta_j\Big\}\right)_+^q \\ &=: \sum_{l=1}^{N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)} \sum_{j=0}^{\epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r)-1} E_j(l). \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

For $l=1,\dots,N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)$ and $0\le j\le \epsilon^{-1}\log_2(R/r)-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_j(l) &= q\int_{u_\epsilon C^*(y)\delta_j}^{\infty}\big[x-u_\epsilon C^*(y)\delta_j\big]^{q-1}\mathrm{P}\Big\{\sup_{\zeta\in Z_l\cap\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}}\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big)\ge x\Big\}\mathrm{d}x\\
&= \big[u_\epsilon C^*(y)\big]^q\delta_j^q\, q\int_1^\infty (z-1)^{q-1}\,\mathrm{P}\Big\{\sup_{\zeta\in Z_l\cap\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}}\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big)\ge zu_\epsilon C^*(y)\delta_j\Big\}\mathrm{d}z\\
&\le \big[u_\epsilon C^*(y)\big]^q\delta_j^q\, q\int_1^\infty (z-1)^{q-1}\,\mathrm{P}\Big\{\sup_{\zeta\in Z_l\cap\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_{\delta_{j+1}}}\Psi\big(\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\big)\ge u_\epsilon C^*(yz)\delta_j\Big\}\mathrm{d}z\\
&\le [u_\epsilon C^*(y)]^q\,\delta_j^q\; q\int_1^\infty (z-1)^{q-1}L_g^{(\epsilon)}\Big(yz, r2^{\epsilon(j+1)}\Big)\mathrm{d}z. \qquad (5.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Here the third line follows from $zC^*(y)\ge C^*(yz)$ for any $z\ge 1$, and the last line is a consequence of (5.9) and the probability bound established above.

The second statement of the theorem follows now from (5.10) and (5.11) since the right hand side in (5.11) does not depend on l. ■

6. Proof of Theorem 1.

6.1. *Preliminaries.* For convenience in this section we present some well–known results that will be repeatedly used in the proofs.

Empirical processes. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a countable set of functions $f:\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}f(X)=0$, $\|f\|_\infty\le b$, $\forall f\in\mathcal{F}$ and put

$$Y=\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{i=1}^n f\big(X_i\big),\quad \sigma^2=\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\mathbb{E}[f(X)]^2.$$

Lemma 1. *For any $x\ge 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{Y-\mathbb{E}Y\ge x\right\}\le\exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2n\sigma^2+4b\mathbb{E}Y+\frac{2}{3}bx}\right\}.$$

The statement of the lemma is an immediate consequence of the the Bennett inequality for empirical processes [see Bousquet (2002)] and the standard arguments allowing to derive the Bernstein inequality from the Bennett inequality.

Inequalities for sums of independent random variables. We recall the well–known Rosenthal and Bahr–Esseen [see von Bahr and Esseen (1965)] bounds on the moments of sums of independent random variables.

Lemma 2. *Let $Y_1,\dots,Y_n$ be independent random variables, $\mathbb{E}Y_i=0$, $i=1,\dots,n$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i\Big|^p\le[c_1(p)]^p\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}|Y_i|^p+\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}Y_i^2\Big)^{p/2}\right\},\qquad p>2;$$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i\Big|^p\le 2\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}|Y_i|^p,\qquad p\in[1,2),$$

where $c_1(p) = 15p/\ln p$.

The constant $c_1(p) = 15p/\ln p$ in the Rosenthal inequality is obtained by symmetrization of the inequality of Theorem 4.1 in Johnson et al. (1985).

Norms of integral operators. In the next statement presents inequalities for norms of integral operators.

Lemma 3. *Let* $(\mathcal{T}, \mathfrak{T}, \tau)$ *and* $(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{X}, \chi)$ *be* σ*-finite spaces,* w *be a* $(\mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{X})$*-measurable function on* $\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}$*, and let*

$$M_{p,\tau,\chi}(w) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|w(\cdot, x)\|_{p,\tau} \ \vee \ \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \|w(t, \cdot)\|_{p,\chi}.$$

If $R \in \mathbb{L}_p(\mathcal{X}, \chi)$ *and* $\mathcal{I}_R(t) := \int w(t,x)R(x)\chi(\mathrm{d}x)$ *then the following statements hold.*

(a). *For any* $p \in [1, \infty]$

$$\big\|\mathcal{I}_R\big\|_{p,\tau} \ \le \ M_{1,\tau,\chi}(w)\|R\|_{p,\chi}. \tag{6.1}$$

(b). *For any* $1 < p < r < \infty$

$$\big\|\mathcal{I}_R\big\|_{r,\tau} \ \le \ c_2(p) M_{q,\tau,\chi}(w)\|R\|_{p,\chi}, \tag{6.2}$$

where $\frac{1}{q} = 1 + \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p}$*, and* $c_2(p)$ *is a numerical constant independent of* w*.*

The statements of the lemma can be found in (Folland 1999, Theorems 6.18 and 6.36).

Note that if $\chi = \nu' := f\nu$ then $M_{p,\tau,\chi}(w) = M_p(w)$, $\forall w$ [see (3.1)]. If $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$, τ and χ are the Lebesgue measures, and if $w(t,x)$ depends on the difference $t - x$ only, then $c_2(p) = 1$, and (6.2) is the well–known Young inequality.

6.2. *Proof of Theorem 1.* We begin with two technical lemmas; their proofs are given in Appendix.

Lemma 4. *Let* $\mathbb{B}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}$ *be the unit ball in* $\mathbb{L}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$*, and suppose that Assumption (A1) hold. Then, there exists a* countable *set* $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathbb{B}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}$ *such that*

$$\big\|\xi_w\big\|_{s,\tau} = \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \int l(t)\xi_w(t)\tau(\mathrm{d}t).$$

Lemma 5. *Let* $\bar{w}(t,x) = w(t,x) - \mathbb{E}w(t,X)$*; then for all* $p \ge 1$ *one has*

(a). $\|\bar{w}(\cdot, x)\|_{p,\tau} \le 2\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|w(\cdot, x)\|_{p,\tau}$.

(b). $M_p(\bar{w}) \le 2M_p(w)$.

We break the proof of Theorem 1 into several steps.

Step 1: reduction to empirical process. We obtain from Lemma 4

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\xi_w\big\|_{s,\tau} &= \sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}}\int l(t)\xi_w(t)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\\ &= \sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}}\sum_{i=1}^n\int l(t)\bar{w}(t,X_i)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)=\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda(X_i),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Lambda=\Big\{\lambda:\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R}:\ \lambda(x)=\int l(t)\bar{w}(t,x)\tau(\mathrm{d}t),\ \ l\in\mathfrak{L}\Big\}.$$

Thus,

$$\big\|\xi_w\big\|_{s,\tau}=\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda(X_i)=:Y, \tag{6.3}$$

and, obviously, $\mathbb{E}\lambda(X)=0$. The idea now is to apply Lemma 1 to the random variable Y.

Step 2: some upper bounds. In order to apply Lemma 1 we need to bound from above the following quantities: (i) $\mathbb{E}Y$; (ii) $b:=\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\|\lambda\|_\infty$; and (iii) $\sigma^2:=\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathbb{E}\lambda^2(X)$.

(i). *Upper bound for* $\mathbb{E}Y$. Applying the Hölder inequality we get from (6.3)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda(X_i)\right]=\mathbb{E}\big\|\xi_w\big\|_{s,\tau}\le\Big[\mathbb{E}\big\|\xi_w\big\|_{s,\tau}^s\Big]^{\frac1s}=\left[\int\mathbb{E}\big|\xi_w(t)\big|^s\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{\frac1s}.$$

If $s\in[1,2]$ then for all $t\in\mathcal{T}$

$$\mathbb{E}\big|\xi_w(t)\big|^s\le\Big[\mathbb{E}\big|\xi_w(t)\big|^2\Big]^{\frac s2}\le\big[n\mathbb{E}\,w^2(t,X)\big]^{\frac s2}=\left[n\int w^2(t,x)f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\right]^{\frac s2}.$$

Thus we have for all $s\in[1,2]$

$$\mathbb{E}Y=\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda(X_i)\right]\le\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f). \tag{6.4}$$

Note that the same quantity can be bounded from above in a different way. Indeed, in view of the Barh-Esseen inequality (the second statement of Lemma 6.8)

$$\mathbb{E}\big|\xi_w(t)\big|^s\le 2n\mathbb{E}\,\big|\bar{w}(t,X)\big|^s=2^{1+s}n\mathbb{E}\,\big|w(t,X)\big|^s.$$

and we obtain for all $s\in[1,2]$

$$\mathbb{E}Y=\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda(X_i)\right]\le 2^{1+1/s}n^{1/s}M_s(w). \tag{6.5}$$

We get finally from (6.4) and (6.5)

$$\mathbb{E}Y\le\Big\{\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f)\Big\}\wedge\Big\{4n^{1/s}M_s(w)\Big\}. \tag{6.6}$$

If $s=2$ we obtain a bound independent of f: indeed, in this case

$$\mathbb{E}Y=\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lambda(X_i)\right]\leq\sqrt{n}\left[\int\int w^2(t,x)f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\leq\sqrt{n}M_2(w). \tag{6.7}$$

If $s>2$ then applying the Rosenthal inequality (the first assertion of Lemma 6.8) to $\xi_w(t)$, which is a sum of i.i.d random variables for any $t\in\mathcal{T}$, we get

$$\left[\mathbb{E}\big|\xi_w(t)\big|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}\leq c_1(s)\left[\left(n\,\mathbb{E}w^2(t,X)\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}+n\,\mathbb{E}\big|\bar{w}(t,X)\big|^s\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lambda(X_i)\right]\leq c_1(s)\Bigg\{&\sqrt{n}\left[\int\left(\int w^2(t,x)f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}\\&+2n^{1/s}\left[\int\int|w(t,x)|^s f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}\Bigg\}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

To get the last inequality we have used that $\mathbb{E}\big|\bar{w}(t,X)\big|^s\leq 2^s\mathbb{E}\big|w(t,X)\big|^s$, for all $s\geq 1$.

It is evident that the second integral on the right hand side of (6.8) does not exceed $M_s(w)$. Moreover, since $\left(\mathbb{E}w^2(t,X)\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\leq\mathbb{E}\big|w(t,X)\big|^s$, $s\geq 2$, the following bound is true $\Sigma_s(w,f)\leq M_s(w)$. We conclude that $\mathbb{E}Y<\infty$ whenever $M_s(w)<\infty$, and

$$\mathbb{E}Y=\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lambda(X_i)\right]\leq c_1(s)\Big\{\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f)+2n^{1/s}M_s(w)\Big\}. \tag{6.9}$$

(ii). *Upper bound for* $b=\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\|\lambda\|_\infty$. Taking into account that $l\in\mathfrak{L}\subset\mathbb{B}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}$ (Lemma 4) and applying the Hölder inequality we get for any $x\in\mathcal{X}$

$$|\lambda(x)|\leq\left[\int\big|w(t,x)-\mathbb{E}w(t,X)\big|^s\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^{\frac{1}{s}}=\|\bar{w}(\cdot,x)\|_{s,\tau}$$

Therefore, in view of Lemma 5(a)

$$b=\|\lambda\|_\infty\leq 2\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\|w(\cdot,x)\|_{s,\tau}\leq 2M_s(w). \tag{6.10}$$

(iii). *Upper bound on the "dual" variance* σ^2. Since $\mathbb{E}\lambda(X)=0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^2&=\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\int\lambda^2(x)f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)=\sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}}\int\left[\int\bar{w}(t,x)l(t)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^2 f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\\&\leq\sup_{l\in\mathbb{B}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}}\int\left[\int\bar{w}(t,x)l(t)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^2 f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\leq\sup_{l\in\mathbb{B}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}}\int\left[\int w(t,x)l(t)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\right]^2 f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x).\end{aligned}$$

The expression on the right hand side is bounded differently depending on the value of s.

If $s \in [1,2)$ then applying the Hölder inequality to the inner integral in the previous expression we obtain

$$\sigma^2 \leq \int \left[\int |w(t,x)|^s \tau(\mathrm{d}t) \right]^{\frac{2}{s}} f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x) \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|w(\cdot,x)\|^2_{s,\tau} \leq M_s^2(w). \tag{6.11}$$

We remark also that the bound given by (6.11) remains true for all $s \geq 1$. This shows, in particular, that σ is always bounded whenever $M_s(w) < \infty$.

If $s = 2$ then we apply inequality (6.1) of Lemma 3 with $p = 2$ and $\chi(\mathrm{d}x) = \nu'(\mathrm{d}x) = f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)$ to the integral operator $\mathcal{I}_l(x) = \int w(t,x)l(t)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)$. This leads to the following bound

$$\sigma^2 \leq M^2_{1,\tau,\nu'}(w). \tag{6.12}$$

If $s > 2$ then we apply the inequality (6.2) of Lemma 3 with $r = 2$, $p = \frac{s}{s-1}$, $q = \frac{2s}{s+2}$ and $\chi = \nu'$ to the integral operator $\mathcal{I}_l(x) = \int w(t,x)l(t)\tau(\mathrm{d}t)$. This yields

$$\sigma^2 \leq c_2(s/(s-1))\, M^2_{q,\tau,\nu'}(w) = c_2(s/(s-1)) M^2_{2s/(s+2),\tau,\nu'}(w). \tag{6.13}$$

Step 3: application of Lemma 1.

1. Case $s \in [1,2)$. Here we have from (6.6), (6.10) and (6.11)

$$\mathbb{E}Y \leq \left\{ \sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f) \right\} \wedge \left\{ 4n^{1/s} M_s(w) \right\} =: \rho_s(w,f), \quad b \leq 2M_s(w), \quad \sigma^2 \leq M_s^2(w).$$

Therefore applying Lemma 1 we have for all $z > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ \|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} \geq \rho_s(w,f) + z \right\} \leq \exp\left\{ -\frac{z^2}{2M_s^2(w)\left[n + 16n^{1/s}\right] + \left[4M_s(w)z/3\right]} \right\}, \tag{6.14}$$

where we have used (6.5) in the denominator of the expression inside of the exponent.

To get the result of the theorem we note that the following trivial upper bound follows from the triangle inequality and the statement (a) of Lemma 5:

$$\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} \leq 2nM_s(w), \quad \forall s \geq 1.$$

Thus, the probability in (6.14) is equal to zero if $z > 2nM_s(w)$; hence we can replace z by $2nM_s(w)$ in the denominator of the expression on the right hand side. This leads to the statement of the theorem for $s \in [1,2)$.

2. Case $s = 2$. We have from (6.7), (6.10) and (6.12)

$$\mathbb{E}Y \leq \sqrt{n} M_2(w), \quad b \leq 2M_2(w), \quad \sigma^2 \leq M^2_{1,\tau,\nu'}(w).$$

Thus, for all $z > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ \|\xi_w\|_{2,\tau} \geq \sqrt{n}\, M_2(w) + z \right\} \leq \exp\left\{ -\frac{z^2}{2\left[nM^2_{1,\tau,\nu'}(w) + 4\sqrt{n}M_2^2(w) + \frac{2}{3}M_2(w)z\right]} \right\},$$

and the statement of Theorem 1 is established for $s = 2$.

3. Case $s > 2$. We have from (6.9), (6.10) and (6.13)

$$\mathbb{E}Y \leq c_1(s)\left[\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f) + 2n^{1/s}M_s(w)\right],$$

$$b \leq 2M_s(w); \qquad \sigma^2 \leq \; c_2(s/(s-1))\, M^2_{2s/(s+2),\tau,\nu'}(w).$$

Thus, for any $z > 0$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\|\xi_w\|_{s,\tau} \;\geq\; c_1(s)\big[\sqrt{n}\,\Sigma_s(w,f) + 2n^{1/s}M_s(w)\big] + z\Big\}$$
$$\leq \exp\bigg\{-\frac{z^2}{2c_3(s)\big[n\,M^2_{\frac{2s}{s+2},\tau,\nu'}(w) + 4\sqrt{n}\Sigma_s(w,f)\,M_s(w) + 8n^{1/s}M_s^2(w) + \frac{2}{3}M_s(w)z\big]}\bigg\},$$

where $c_3(s)$ is given in (3.2). This completes the proof of the theorem for the case of $s > 2$.

We conclude by establishing the inequalities in (3.6). In order to derive the first inequality we apply (6.1) of Lemma 3 with $p = s/2 > 1$, $\chi = \nu$ to the integral operator $\mathcal{I}_f(t) := \int w^2(t,x)f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)$. This yields

$$\bigg[\int\bigg(\int w^2(t,x)f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\bigg)^{s/2}\tau(\mathrm{d}t)\bigg]^{1/s} \leq M_2(w)\|\sqrt{f}\|_{s,\nu},$$

as claimed. The second inequality in (3.6) follows straightforwardly from the definition of $M_{p,\tau,\nu'}$ and M_p. ∎

7. Proofs of Theorem 3 and Corollary 4.

7.1. *Proof of Theorem 3.* First we specify the constants appearing in the theorem statement:

$$T_{1,\epsilon} \;:=\; \bigg(\frac{2^{q(\epsilon+1)}}{2^{q\epsilon}-1}\Gamma(q+1)+1\bigg)N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)(2u_\epsilon R_\xi)^q\log_2(R_\xi/r_\xi)\big[1+L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp}\big],$$

$$T_{2,\epsilon} \;:=\; \big[c_1(s)+2\big]^q N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\log_2\,(R_\xi/r_\xi)\big[1+L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp}\big].$$

Recall that in view of (3.7), any $w \in \mathcal{W}$ is represented as $w = \phi[\zeta]$ for some $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}$. For every $0 \leq j \leq \log_2(R_\xi/r_\xi) - 1$ (without loss of generality we assume that $\log_2(R_\xi/r_\xi)$ is an integer number), put $\delta_j = r2^{j+1}$, and define the random events

$$\mathcal{A} := \bigcap_{j=0}^{\log_2(R_\xi/r_\xi)-1}\mathcal{A}_j, \qquad \mathcal{A}_j := \Big\{\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}}\|\xi_{\phi^2[\zeta]}\|_{s/2,\tau} \leq \big[2(1+\epsilon)\gamma\delta_j\big]^2\Big\}.$$

(i). The following trivial inequality holds

$$\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\|\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\|_{s,\tau} - \bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)C^*_\xi(y)\hat{U}_\xi(\phi[\zeta])\Big\}_+$$
$$\leq \sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\|\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\|_{s,\tau} - u_\epsilon C^*_\xi(y)U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta],f\big)\Big\}_+ + u_\epsilon C^*_\xi(y)\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta],f\big).$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\|\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\|_{s,\tau} - \bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)C^*_\xi(y)\hat{U}_\xi(\phi[\zeta])\Big\}^q_+$$
$$\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\|\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\|_{s,\tau} - \bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)C^*_\xi(y)\hat{U}_\xi(\phi[\zeta])\Big\}^q_+\mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A})\Big] \tag{7.1}$$
$$+\,2^{q-1}\mathbb{E}\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\|\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\|_{s,\tau} - u_\epsilon C^*_\xi(y)U_\xi(\phi[\zeta],f)\Big\}^q_+ \,+\, 2^{q-1}\big[u_\epsilon C^*_\xi(y)R_\xi\big]^q\sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(R_\xi/r_\xi)-1}\mathbb{P}\{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j\},$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j$ denotes the event complementary to $\mathcal{A}_j$, and $\mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A})$ is the indicator of the event $\mathcal{A}$. The second term on the right hand side is bounded using Theorem 2; our current goal is to bound the first and the third term.

Note that, if the event $\mathcal{A}$ holds then for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\big[1 + 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma\big] \;\geq\; \hat{U}_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) \;\geq\; U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\big[1 - 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma\big]. \tag{7.2}$$

Indeed, in view of (3.9), (3.13) and (3.14) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) &\geq U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big) - \Big|\hat{U}_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) - U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\Big| \\ &= U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big) - c_1(s)\sqrt{n}\,\Big|\hat{\Sigma}_s\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) - \Sigma_s\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\Big| \\ &\geq U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big) - c_1(s)\sqrt{\|\xi_{\phi^2[\zeta]}\|_{s/2,\tau}}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}$ be fixed. Since $\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}$, $j = 0, \ldots, \log_2(R_\xi/r_\xi) - 1$, defined in (3.15), form the partition of $\mathbb{Z}$, there exists j_* such that $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j_*}}$. Taking into account that $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_{j_*}}$ implies $U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big) \geq \delta_{j_*}/2 = \delta_{j_*-1}$, we obtain from (7.3) on the event $\mathcal{A}$ that

$$\hat{U}_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) \;\geq\; U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big) - 2c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma\delta_{j_*} \geq U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\big[1 - 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma\big]. \tag{7.4}$$

Thus, the right hand side inequality in (7.2) is proved. Similarly, we have from (7.3) and (7.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) &\leq U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big) + \Big|\hat{U}_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) - U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\Big| \\ &\leq U\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) + c_1(s)\sqrt{\|\xi_{\phi^2[\zeta]}\|_{s/2,\tau}} \;\leq\; U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\big[1 + 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (7.2) is proved.

Using the right hand side inequality in (7.2) and applying Theorem 2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\|\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\|_{s,\tau} - \bar{u}_\epsilon(\gamma)C^*_\xi(y)\hat{U}_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta]\big)\Big\}_+^q\,\mathbf{1}(\mathcal{A})\Big] \\ &\leq\; \mathbb{E}\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}}\Big\{\|\xi_{\phi[\zeta]}\|_{s,\tau} - u_\epsilon C^*_\xi(y)U_\xi\big(\phi[\zeta], f\big)\Big\}_+^q \\ &\leq\; \frac{2^{q(\epsilon+1)}u_\epsilon^q}{2^{q\epsilon}-1}\,\Gamma(q+1)\,N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\,\big[R_\xi C^*_\xi(1)\big]^q\big[1 + L^{(\epsilon)}_{\exp}\big]\exp\{-y/2\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

Now we bound the probability $\mathbb{P}\{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j\}$. Let Z_l, $l = 1, \ldots, N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)$ be a minimal covering of $\mathbb{Z}$ by balls of the radius $\epsilon/8$ in the metric d. By definition of $\mathcal{A}_j$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j\} \;\leq\; \sum_{l=1}^{N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)}\mathbb{P}\Big\{\sup_{\zeta\in Z_l\cap\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}}\|\xi_{\phi^2[\zeta]}\|_{s/2,\tau} \geq \big[2(1+\epsilon)\gamma\delta_j\big]^2\Big\}. \tag{7.6}$$

Note that

$$\big[2\gamma\delta_j\big]^2 \;\geq\; \varkappa_{\tilde{U}}\big(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}\big) + \delta_j^2\big[\sqrt{y_\gamma}\lambda_{\tilde{A}} + y_\gamma\lambda_{\tilde{B}}\big] \;\geq\; \varkappa_{\tilde{U}}\big(Z_l\cap\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}\big) + \delta_j^2\big[\sqrt{y}\lambda_{\tilde{A}} + y\lambda_{\tilde{B}}\big];$$

here the first inequality follows from the condition $\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(\mathbb{Z}_a) = \varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(a) \le (\gamma a)^2$, $\forall a \in [r_\xi, R_\xi]$ and from definition of y_γ; the second inequality holds by the inclusion $Z_l \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}$ and because $y \le y_\gamma$. Furthermore, by (3.16) and by the above inclusion

$$\lambda_{\tilde{A}} \ge \delta_j^{-2}\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}) \ge \delta_j^{-2}\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j} \cap Z_l), \quad \lambda_{\tilde{B}} \ge \delta_j^{-2}\Lambda_{\tilde{B}}(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}) \ge \delta_j^{-2}\Lambda_{\tilde{B}}(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j} \cap Z_l),$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\big[2\gamma\delta_j\big]^2 &\ge \varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(Z_l \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}) + \sqrt{y}\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j} \cap Z_l) + y\Lambda_{\tilde{B}}(\mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j} \cap Z_l) \\ &= \varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(Z_l \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}) + \tilde{C}_*(y, Z_l \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C}_*(y,\cdot) := \sqrt{y}\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}(\cdot) + y\Lambda_{\tilde{B}}(\cdot)$ [cf. (2.4)].

Hence applying Proposition 1 we obtain from (7.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_j\} &\le \sum_{l=1}^{N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)} \mathbb{P}\Big\{\sup_{\zeta \in Z_l \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j}} \|\xi_{\phi^2[\zeta]}\|_{s/2,\tau} \ge (1+\epsilon)\big[\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}\big(Z_l \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j} + \tilde{C}^*(y, Z_l \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\delta_j})\big]\Big\} \\ &\le N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\Big[\exp\{-y\} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \exp\Big\{2\mathcal{E}_{Z,\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon 2^{-k}) - 9y2^{k-3}k^{-2}\Big\}\Big] \\ &\le N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\big[1 + L_{\exp}^{(\epsilon)}\big]\exp\{-y/2\}, \qquad (7.7)\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $y \ge 1$.

Finally, combining (7.1), (7.5), the bound of Theorem 2, and (7.7) we come to the first assertion of the theorem. Here we also used that $C_\xi^*(1) \le C_\xi(y)$ because $y \ge 1$.

(ii). To prove the second statement we note first the following non-random bound: since $\hat{\Sigma}_s(w) \le M_s(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $s > 2$,

$$\hat{U}_s(w) \;\le\; M_s(w)[c_1(s)\sqrt{n} + 2n^{1/s}] \;\le\; [c_1(s) + 2]\sqrt{n}M_s(w), \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Next, the left inequality in (7.2) implies that for any subset $\mathcal{W}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}$

$$\mathcal{A} \subseteq \Big\{\sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}_0} \hat{U}_\xi(w) < [1 + 4c_1(s)(1+\epsilon)\gamma]\sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}_0} U_\xi(w,f)\Big\} =: \mathcal{A}_0.$$

Therefore $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0) \le \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{A}})$, and

$$\mathbb{E}\Big\{[\hat{U}(w)]^q\,\mathbf{1}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0)\Big\} \;\le\; [c_1(s)+2]^q\big[\sqrt{n}M_s(w)\big]^q\,\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{A}}).$$

Using (7.7) with $y = y_\gamma$, and definition of the event $\mathcal{A}$ we complete the proof. ■

7.2. *Proof of Corollary 4.* First, as in (7.2), we need to bound $\breve{U}_\xi(w) := \max\{\hat{U}_\xi(w), \sqrt{n}M_2(w)\}$ from above and from below in terms of $\bar{U}_\xi(w,f) := \max\{U_\xi(w,f), \sqrt{n}M_2(w)\}$. Such bounds are easily derived from the following trivial fact: for any positive A, B, C and any $\delta \in (0,1)$

$$A(1+\delta) \ge B \ge A(1-\delta) \quad \Rightarrow \quad [A \vee C](1+\delta) \ge [B \vee C] \ge [A \vee C](1-\delta).$$

Next, (7.5) remains valid because, by construction, $U_\xi(w,f) \le \bar{U}_\xi(w,f)$ and the assumptions, allowing to apply Theorem 2 are imposed now on $\bar{U}_\xi(w,f)$ instead of $U_\xi(w,f)$. The computations leading to (7.7) remain also unchanged if $U_\xi(w,f)$ is replaced by $\bar{U}_\xi(w,f)$. Note that now $\lambda_{\tilde{A}}$ and $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ are defined via $\bar{U}_\xi(w,f)$. ■

8. Proofs of Theorems 4, 5.

8.1. *Proof of Theorem 4.* The proof is based on application of Theorem 2.
Put

$$T_{3,\epsilon}:=\frac{2^{q(\epsilon+1)}u_\epsilon^q}{2^{q\epsilon}-1}\Gamma(q+1)N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\big[1+L^{(\epsilon)}_{\mathrm{exp}}\big]\Big[4\bar{\mathrm{w}}_s\big(1+4n^{1/2-1/s}\big)\Big]^q;$$

$$T_{4,\epsilon}:=\frac{2^{q(\epsilon+1)}u_\epsilon^q}{2^{q\epsilon}-1}\Gamma(q+1)N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(\epsilon/8)\big[1+L^{(\epsilon)}_{\mathrm{exp}}\big]\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2^q\Big\{1+2\sqrt{2\mu_*\mathrm{f}_\infty^2+8n^{-1/2}}+(8/3)n^{-1/2}\Big\}^q.$$

We have $M_p(w)=\|w\|_p$ for all $w\in\mathcal{V}$ and $p\geq 1$, and (3.9) yields

$$U_\xi(w,f)\;=\;\begin{cases}4n^{1/s}\|w\|_s, & s\in[1,2),\\ \sqrt{n}\|w\|_2, & s=2.\end{cases}\tag{8.1}$$

Therefore, in view of (3.10)

$$r_\xi=\begin{cases}4n^{1/s}\underline{\mathrm{w}}_s, & s\in[1,2),\\ \sqrt{n}\,\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2, & s=2,\end{cases}\qquad R_\xi=\begin{cases}4n^{1/s}\bar{\mathrm{w}}_s, & s\in[1,2),\\ \sqrt{n}\,\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2, & s=2.\end{cases}\tag{8.2}$$

It follows from (3.23), the Hölder inequality and the formulas for $A^2_\xi(w)$ and $B_\xi(w)$ immediately after (3.9) that

$$A^2_\xi(w)\;\leq\;\begin{cases}37n\|w\|_s^2, & s\in[1,2),\\ \big[2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2 n\mu_*+8\sqrt{n}\big]\|w\|_2^2, & s=2,\end{cases}\qquad B_\xi(w)=\begin{cases}0, & s\in[1,2),\\ \frac{4}{3}\|w\|_2, & s=2.\end{cases}\tag{8.3}$$

In order to apply Theorem 2 we need to check that $\varkappa_{U_\xi}(a)\leq a$ for all $a\in[r_\xi,R_\xi]$.

Let $s\in[1,2)$; here $\mathbb{Z}_a=\{\zeta:a/2<4n^{1/s}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_s=4n^{1/2}\|w\|_s\leq a\}$, see (3.15). By (8.1), Assumption (L) and because $\mathbb{Z}_a\subseteq\mathbb{Z}_s(a/4)$ we have

$$\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\frac{U_\xi(\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2],f)}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\;\leq\;\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_s(a/4)}\frac{4n^{1/s}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_s}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\leq a.$$

If $s=2$ then $\mathbb{Z}_a=\{\zeta:a/2<\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2=\sqrt{n}\|w\|_2\leq a\}$, and again by Assumption (L) $\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a}[\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_2/\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]\leq a$. Thus $\varkappa_{U_\xi}(a)\leq a$ for all $a\in[r_\xi,R_\xi]$, and Theorem 2 can be applied. To this end, we should compute the quantities Λ_{A_ξ} and Λ_{B_ξ} [see (2.2), (2.3) and (2.8)].

For $s\in[1,2)$ we have by (8.3), definition of $\mathbb{Z}_a$ and Assumption (L) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}A_\xi(\phi[\zeta])\;&=\;\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\sqrt{37n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_s=\frac{\sqrt{37}}{4}an^{1/2-1/s},\\ \sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\frac{A_\xi(\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2])}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\;&\leq\;\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_s(a/4)}\frac{\sqrt{37}n^{1/2}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_s}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\leq\frac{\sqrt{37}}{4}an^{1/2-1/s}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $s=2$ then $\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}A_\xi(\phi[\zeta])\leq a(2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\mu_*+8n^{-1/2})^{1/2}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\frac{A_\xi(\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2])}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\;&\leq\;\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_2(a)}[2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2 n\mu_*+8\sqrt{n}]^{1/2}\frac{\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_2}{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\\ &\leq\;a\bigg(2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2\mu_*+\frac{8}{\sqrt{n}}\bigg)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

These computations, and similar computations for Λ_{B_ξ} yield

$$\Lambda_{A_\xi} \le \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{37}}{4} n^{1/2-1/s}, & s \in [1,2), \\ \big[2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2 \mu_* + 8n^{-1/2}\big]^{1/2}, & s = 2, \end{cases} \qquad \Lambda_{B_\xi} = \begin{cases} 0, & s \in [1,2), \\ \frac{4}{3} n^{-1/2}, & s = 2. \end{cases}$$

Recall that $C_\xi^*(y) = 1 + 2\sqrt{y}\Lambda_{A_\xi} + 2y\Lambda_{B_\xi}$ [see (2.9)]. Therefore if for arbitrary $z > 0$ we set

$$y = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{37} n^{(2/s)-1} z^2, & s \in [1,2), \\ \frac{z^2}{8}\big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^2 \mu_* + 4n^{-1/2}\big]^{-1}, & s = 2, \end{cases}$$

then we get $C_\xi^*(y) = 1 + z$ if $s \in [1,2)$, and

$$C_\xi^*(y) = 1 + z + \frac{z^2}{3\sqrt{n}[\mathrm{f}_\infty^2 \mu_* + 4n^{-1/2}]} \le 1 + z + \frac{z^2}{12}$$

if $s = 2$. Then the statements (i)–(ii) follow by application of the moment bound of Theorem 2. Observe that $C_\xi(1) = 1 + \frac{\sqrt{37}}{2} n^{-1/2-1/s}$ for $s \in [1,2)$, and $C_\xi(1) = 1 + 2\big[2\mathrm{f}_\infty^2 \mu_* + 8n^{-1/2}\big]^{1/2} + \frac{4}{3} n^{-1/2}$ for $s = 2$; R_ξ is given in (8.2). These expressions along with the moment bound of Theorem 2 lead to the formulas for $T_{1,\epsilon}$ and $T_{2,\epsilon}$ given in the beginning of the proof. ∎

8.2. *Proof of Theorem 5.* First we specify the constants appearing in the statement of the theorem. Put $\alpha_* := \alpha_1^{-1}\alpha_2^{-1/2}$ where α_1 and α_2 appear in Assumption (W2); then

$$\vartheta_1 := [148\alpha_*^4]^{-1}, \quad \vartheta_2 := 5\sqrt{2} c_1(s/2) \mathrm{f}_\infty \alpha_*^2 C_{s/2}. \tag{8.4}$$

Define also

$$k_* := 8\alpha_*^2 c_1(s)\big[C_s \vee C_{s/2} \vee 1\big], \quad L_*^{(\epsilon)}(\beta) := \sum_{k=1}^\infty \exp\Big\{2^{1+k\beta/m}(k_*^{-1}\epsilon)^{-\beta/m} - (9/16)\, 2^k k^{-2}\Big\}, \tag{8.5}$$

and note that $L_*^{(\epsilon)}(\beta) < \infty$ because $\beta < m$. If we set $I_\epsilon(q) := 2^{q(\epsilon+1)}[2^{q\epsilon} - 1]^{-1}\Gamma(q+1) + 1$ then the constants $T_{5,\epsilon}$ and $T_{6,\epsilon}$ appearing in the statement of the theorem are given by

$$T_{5,\epsilon} := I_\epsilon(q)(2u_\epsilon k_* \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2)^q N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}\Big([k_*^{-1}\epsilon/8]^{1/m}\Big) \log_2\left(\frac{k_*\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2}{\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2}\right)\Big[1 + L_*^{(\epsilon)}(\beta)\exp\{2C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta)\}\Big], \tag{8.6}$$

$$T_{6,\epsilon} := [c_1(s) + 2]^q(\alpha_*\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2)^q N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}\Big([k_*^{-1}\epsilon/8]^{1/m}\Big) \log_2\left(\frac{k_*\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2}{\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2}\right)\Big[1 + L_*^{(\epsilon)}(\beta)\exp\{2C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta)\}\Big]. \tag{8.7}$$

The proof is based on application of Theorem 3 and Corollary 4. These results will be utilized with a distance d_* on $\mathfrak{Z}$ which is related to the original distance d, and specified below. In order to apply Theorem 3 we need to verify its conditions and to compute the quantities Λ_{A_ξ}, Λ_{B_ξ}, $\lambda_{\tilde{A}}$, $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ and y_γ. These computations are routine and tedious.

We break the proof into steps.

0^0. *Auxiliary results.* We begin with preliminary results that will be used in the subsequent proof.

Lemma 6. *Let (3.21) hold and Assumptions (W2) and (W3) be satisfied; then for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $1 \le p < q \le \infty$ one has*

$$\Big[n^{1/q} M_q(w)\Big] \le \alpha_1^{-1}\alpha_2^{-1/p}\mu^{1/q-1/p}\Big[n^{1/p}M_p(w)\Big].$$

Proof. Recall that under (3.21), $M_p(w) = \|w\|_p$ for all $p \ge 1$. In view of Assumption (W2) for any $w \in \mathcal{V}$ we have

$$\alpha_1\alpha_2^{1/p}\|w\|_\infty\big[\mathrm{mes}\{\mathrm{supp}(w)\}\big]^{1/p} \;\le\; \|w\|_p \;\le \|w\|_\infty\big[\mathrm{mes}\{\mathrm{supp}(w)\}\big]^{1/p}.$$

This inequality, together with Assumption (W3), yields

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/q}\|w\|_q &\le n^{1/q}\|w\|_\infty\big[\mathrm{mes}\{\mathrm{supp}(w)\}\big]^{1/q} \\ &= \frac{n^{1/p}\|w\|_\infty\big[\mathrm{mes}\{\mathrm{supp}(w)\}\big]^{1/p}}{\big[n\,\mathrm{mes}\{\mathrm{supp}(w)\}\big]^{1/p-1/q}} \;\le\; \alpha_1^{-1}\alpha_2^{-1/p}\mu^{1/q-1/p}\big[n^{1/p}\|w\|_p\big]. \end{aligned}$$

∎

Our next lemma demonstrates that there exists a real number $m_p \in (0, 1]$ such that (3.27) holds.

Lemma 7. *Let Assumptions (W) and (L) hold; then for any $p \ge 2$, the inequality (3.27) is valid with $m_p = 2/p$ and $C_p = (2\alpha_*)^{1-2/p}\mu^{1/p-1/2}$, i.e.,*

$$\sup_{b\in[\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2,\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2]} b^{-1} \sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_2(b)} \frac{n^{1/p}\big\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_p}{\big[\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\big]^{2/p}} \le (2\alpha_*)^{1-2/p}\mu^{1/p-1/2}.$$

Proof. We obviously have for any $p > 2$

$$\big\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_p \;\le\; \Big(\big\|\phi[\zeta_1]\big\|_\infty + \big\|\phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_\infty\Big)^{1-2/p}\Big(\big\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_2\Big)^{2/p}.$$

Applying Lemma 6 with $q = \infty$ and $p = 2$, we have that $\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_2(b)}\big\|\phi[\zeta]\big\|_\infty \le b\alpha_*\mu^{-1/2}$ for all $b \in [\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2]$. Then in view of Assumption (L)

$$\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_1\in\mathbb{Z}_2(b)} \frac{n^{1/p}\big\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\big\|_p}{[\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{2/p}} \le\; b(2\alpha_*)^{1-2/p}\mu^{1/m-1/2}, \quad \forall b \in [\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2],$$

as claimed. ∎

Lemma 8. *Let Assumptions (W) and (L) hold; then for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_a$*

$$\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_p \;\le\; \mu_*^{1/p-1/2}a, \quad \forall p \in [1, 2), \tag{8.8}$$

$$n^{1/p}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_p \;\le\; \alpha_*\mu^{1/p-1/2}a, \quad \forall p > 2, \tag{8.9}$$

$$\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_p \;\le\; \alpha_*\mu^{-1/2}\mu_*^{1/p-1/2}a^2, \quad \forall p \in [1, 2). \tag{8.10}$$

Proof. By the Hölder inequality $\|\phi[\zeta]\|_p \le \mu_*^{1/p-1/2}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2$; then (8.8) holds by definition of $\mathbb{Z}_a$. The inequality (8.9) follows Lemma 6. In order to prove (8.10) we write $\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_p \le \|\phi[\zeta]\|_\infty\|\phi[\zeta]\|_p$, note that by Lemma 6 $\|\phi[\zeta]\|_\infty \le \alpha_*\mu^{-1/2}\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2$ and use (8.9). ∎

1^0. *Notation.* Now we establish some notation. Recall that $U_\xi(w,f) = c_1(s)[\sqrt{n}\,\Sigma_s(w,f) + 2n^{1/s}M_s(w)]$ and $\bar{U}_\xi(w,f)$ is given by (3.28). It follows from the definition of $\bar{U}_\xi(\cdot,f)$, (3.9) and (3.6) that $\bar{U}_\xi(w,f) \geq \sqrt{n}\|w\|_2$ and

$$\bar{U}_\xi(w,f) \;\leq\; c_1(s)\Big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2-1/s}\sqrt{n}\|w\|_2 + 2n^{1/s}\|w\|_s\Big] \;\leq\; c_1(s)\alpha_*\big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2\big]\sqrt{n}\|w\|_2,$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of Lemma 6. Therefore we put

$$r_\xi = \sqrt{n}\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2, \qquad R_\xi = c_1(s)\alpha_*\big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2\big]\sqrt{n}\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2,$$

where $\underline{\mathrm{w}}_p$ and $\bar{\mathrm{w}}_p$ are defined in (3.24). Recall also that $\mathbb{Z}_a = \{\zeta : a/2 < \bar{U}_\xi(\phi[\zeta],f) \leq a\}$. By definition of $\bar{U}_\xi(w,f)$ and by the fact that $M_p(w) = \|w\|_p$ for all $p \geq 1$ we have that $\mathbb{Z}_a \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2(a)$ for all $a \in [r_\xi, R_\xi]$; see (3.25). Define the distance

$$\mathrm{d}_*(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) \;=\; k_* \times \begin{cases} \mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) \vee [\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{m_s}, & s\in[1,4), \\ \mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) \vee [\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{m_s} \vee [\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{m_{s/2}}, & s>4, \end{cases} \tag{8.11}$$

where k_* is given in (8.5). Note that $\mathrm{d}_*(\cdot,\cdot)$ is indeed a distance because by definition $m_p \leq 1$ for all $p \geq 2$.

2^0. *Verification of the condition (3.17).* It follows from definition of $\bar{U}_\xi(\cdot,f)$, (3.9) and (3.6) that

$$\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2 \;\leq\; \bar{U}_\xi(\phi[\zeta],f) \;\leq\; c_1(s)\Big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2-1/s}\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2 + 2n^{1/s}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_s\Big]. \tag{8.12}$$

Therefore, by (8.12), Assumption (L) and (3.27) for any $\zeta_1,\zeta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_a$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_\xi(\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2],f) \;&\leq\; c_1(s)\Big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2-1/s}\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_2 + 2n^{1/s}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_s\Big] \\ &\leq\; c_1(s)[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2C_s]\,a\,\Big\{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\vee[\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{m_s}\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2}\frac{\bar{U}_\xi(\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2],f)}{\mathrm{d}_*(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)} \;\leq\; a, \quad \forall a\in[r_\xi,R_\xi],$$

and (3.17) is valid, because $k_* \geq c_1(s)[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2C_s]$; see (8.5) and (8.11).

3^0. *Computation of $\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}$ and verification of (3.18).*

We start with bounds on $\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta])$. Recall that

$$\tilde{U}\big(\phi^2[\zeta]\big) \;=\; \begin{cases} 4n^{2/s}M_{s/2}\big(\phi^2[\zeta]\big), & s\in(2,4), \\ c_1(s/2)\big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}\sqrt{n}M_2(\phi^2[\zeta]) + 2n^{2/s}M_{s/2}(\phi^2[\zeta])\big], & s\geq 4. \end{cases} \tag{8.13}$$

By (8.9), for any $\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a$

$$n^{2/s}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_{s/2} \;=\; \big(n^{1/s}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_s\big)^2 \;\leq\; \alpha_*^2\mu^{(2/s)-1}n\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2^2 \;\leq\; \alpha_*^2\mu^{(2/s)-1}a^2, \quad \forall s>2, \tag{8.14}$$

$$\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_2 \;=\; \big(n^{1/4}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_4\big)^2 \;\leq\; \alpha_*^2\mu^{-1/2}n\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2^2 \;\leq\; \alpha_*^2\mu^{-1/2}a^2. \tag{8.15}$$

Substituting these bounds in the expression for $\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta])$ and taking into account that $\mu \geq 1$ in view of (W3) we obtain for all $s>2$

$$\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta]) \;\leq\; k_1\,\mu^{\frac{2}{s\wedge 4}-1}a^2, \quad k_1 := 4\alpha_*^2c_1(s/2)[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2]. \tag{8.16}$$

Now we establish bounds on $\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2])$, $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a$.

(a). First we consider the case $s\in(2,4)$. By the Hölder and triangle inequalities we have

$$n^{2/s}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_{s/2}\le n^{2/s-1/2}\Big[\|\phi[\zeta_1]\|_{2s/(4-s)}+\|\phi[\zeta_2]\|_{2s/(4-s)}\Big]\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_2.$$

Noting that $2s/(4-s)>2$ and applying (8.9) we have

$$n^{2/s-1/2}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_{2s/(4-s)}\;\le\;\alpha_*\mu^{2/s-1}\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2\;\le\;\alpha_*\mu^{2/s-1}a,\quad\forall\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a.$$

Then using Assumption (L) we get

$$n^{2/s}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_{s/2}\le 2\alpha_*\mu^{2/s-1}a^2\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2),\quad\forall\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a.\tag{8.17}$$

This along with (8.13) implies that for $s\in(2,4)$

$$\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2])\;\le\;8\alpha_*\mu^{2/s-1}a^2\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2),\quad\forall\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a.\tag{8.18}$$

(b). Now assume that $s\ge4$. We have for $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a$

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_2\;&\le\;\Big[\|\phi[\zeta_1]\|_\infty+\|\phi[\zeta_2]\|_\infty\Big]\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_2\\&\le\;2\alpha_*\mu^{-1/2}a^2\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2),\end{aligned}\tag{8.19}$$

where we used Assumption (L), and (8.9) with $p=\infty$. Furthermore, we have for all $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}$

$$\begin{aligned}n^{2/s}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_{s/2}\;&\le\;\Big[\|\phi[\zeta_1]\|_\infty+\|\phi[\zeta_2]\|_\infty\Big]n^{2/s}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_{s/2}\\&\le\;2C_{s/2}\alpha_*\mu^{-1/2}a^2\{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\}^{m_{s/2}},\end{aligned}\tag{8.20}$$

where we have used (8.9) with $p=\infty$ and the definition of m_p [see (3.27)]. These inequalities lead to the following bound: for all $s>4$

$$\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2])\;\;\le\;\;2\alpha_*c_1(s/2)\Big[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2C_{s/2}\Big]\mu^{-1/2}a^2\Big\{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\vee\big[\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\big]^{m_{s/2}}\Big\}.$$

Combining this with (8.18) we obtain that for all $s>2$

$$\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2])\;\le\;k_2\,\mu^{\frac{2}{s\wedge4}-1}a^2\big\{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\vee\mathrm{d}^{m_{s/2}}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\big\}.\tag{8.21}$$

where $k_2:=8\alpha_*c_1(s/2)[\mathrm{f}_\infty^{1/2}+2C_{s/2}]$. Now using (8.16) and (8.21) we obtain

$$\varkappa_{\tilde{U}}(a)=\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\frac{\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2])}{\mathrm{d}_*(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)}\;\vee\;\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\tilde{U}(\phi^2[\zeta])\;\le\;\mu^{\frac{2}{s\wedge4}-1}a^2,$$

and the last bound holds because $k_*\ge k_1\vee k_2$ [see (8.5)]. Thus the condition (3.18) is valid with

$$\gamma=\mu^{\frac{1}{s\wedge4}-\frac{1}{2}}.\tag{8.22}$$

Note that the theorem condition $\mu>[64c_1^2(s)]^{s\wedge4/(s\wedge4-2)}$ ensures $\gamma<[4c_1(1+\epsilon)]^{-1}$ for any $\epsilon\in(0,1)$ as required in Theorem 3.

4^0. *Bounding* Λ_{A_ξ} *and* Λ_{B_ξ}. By the formula for $A^2_\xi(w)$ given immediately after (3.9), and by (8.8) and (8.9) we have for $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_a$

$$\begin{aligned} A^2_\xi(\phi[\zeta]) &\le 2c_1(s)\mathrm{f}^2_\infty\Big[n\|\phi[\zeta]\|^2_{2s/(s+2)} + 4\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|_2\|\phi[\zeta]\|_s + 8n^{1/s}\|\phi[\zeta]\|^2_s\Big] \\ &\le 2c_1(s)\mathrm{f}^2_\infty a^2\big[\mu_*^{2/s} + 12\alpha_*^2 n^{-1/s}\big] \le 24\alpha_*^2 c_1(s)\mathrm{f}^2_\infty a^2\big[\mu_*^{2/s} + n^{-1/s}\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that $\mu \ge 1$, $\alpha_* \ge 1$ and we write $c_1(s)$ instead of $c_3(s)$ in the definition of $A^2(\cdot)$ because for functions $w(t,x)$ depending on $t-x$ only the constant $c_2(s)$ equals one [see (3.2), and remark after Lemma 3 in Section 6]. Thus

$$\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a} A_\xi(\phi[\zeta]) \le 5\sqrt{c_1(s)}\alpha_*\mathrm{f}_\infty a\big[\mu_*^{1/s} + n^{-1/(2s)}\big].$$

In order to bound $A^2_\xi(\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2])$ we note that for all $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a$:

- by the Hölder inequality and by Assumption (L), $\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_{2s/(s+2)} \le a\mu_*^{1/s}\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)$;
- by Assumption (L), $\sqrt{n}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_2 \le a\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)$;
- by (3.27), $n^{1/s}\|\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]\|_s \le C_s a[\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{m_s}$.

Therefore

$$\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\frac{A_\xi(\phi[\zeta_1]-\phi[\zeta_2]}{\mathrm{d}_*(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)} \le 5\sqrt{c_1(s)}\mathrm{f}_\infty(C_s\vee 1)a\big[\mu_*^{1/s}+n^{-1/(2s)}\big],$$

and $\Lambda_{A_\xi} \le 5\sqrt{c_1(s)}\alpha_*\mathrm{f}_\infty(C_s\vee 1)[\mu_*^{1/s}+n^{-1/(2s)}]$. Similarly, since $B_\xi(\phi[\zeta]) = \frac{4}{3}c_1(s)\|\phi[\zeta]\|_s$, we have by (8.9) that $\Lambda_{B_\xi} \le \frac{4}{3}c_1(s)(C_s\vee 1)\alpha_* n^{-1/s}$. Thus we have shown that

$$\Lambda_{A_\xi} \le k_3[\mu_*^{1/s}+n^{-1/(2s)}], \quad \Lambda_{B_\xi} \le k_3 n^{-1/s}, \quad k_3 := 5c_1(s)\alpha_*\mathrm{f}_\infty(C_s\vee 1).$$

These bounds on Λ_{A_ξ} and Λ_{B_ξ} lead to the definition of $C^*_\xi(y)$ in (3.29) [see also (2.9)]. Note that ϑ_0 in (3.29) satisfies $\vartheta_0 = k_3$.

5^0. *Computation of* $\lambda_{\tilde{A}}$, $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ *and* y_γ.

(i). First consider the case $s\in(2,4)$. Recall that in this case $\tilde{A}^2(\phi^2[\zeta]) = 37n\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|^2_{s/2} = 37n\|\phi[\zeta]\|^4_s$, and $\tilde{B}(\phi^2[\zeta])=0$. Hence, by (8.9)

$$\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\tilde{A}(\phi^2[\zeta]) = \sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\sqrt{37n}\|\phi[\zeta]\|^2_s \le \sqrt{37}\alpha_*^2\mu^{2/s-1}n^{1/2-2/s}a^2.$$

It follows from (8.17) that for any $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a$

$$\sqrt{37n}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_{s/2} \le 2\sqrt{37}\alpha_*\mu^{2/s-1}n^{1/2-2/s}a^2\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2).$$

Combining these results we obtain that $\lambda_{\tilde{A}} \le 2\sqrt{37}\alpha_*^2\mu^{2/s-1}n^{1/2-2/s}$, and $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}=0$ which, in turn, by (3.19) and(8.22) implies that

$$y_\gamma = \gamma^4\lambda_{\tilde{A}}^{-2} \ge (2\sqrt{37}\alpha_*^2)^{-2}n^{4/s-1} =: y_*.$$

This explains the definition of the constant ϑ_1 in (8.4).

(ii). Now let $s\ge 4$; here recall that

$$\tilde{A}^2(\phi^2[\zeta]) = 2c_1(s/2)\mathrm{f}^2_\infty\big[n\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|^2_{2s/(s+4)} + 4\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_2\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_{s/2} + 8n^{2/s}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|^2_{s/2}\Big].$$

Observing that for $\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a$:

(a). $\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_{2s/(s+4)} \le \alpha_*\mu_*^{2/s}a^2$ by (8.10) and $\mu \ge 1$;
(b). $n^{1/s}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_{s/2} \le \alpha_*^2 n^{-1/s}a^2$ by (8.14);
(c). $\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_2\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_{s/2} \le \alpha_*^2\mu^{-1/2}n^{-2/s}a^4$ by (8.15) and (b),

we obtain

$$\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\tilde{A}(\phi[\zeta]) \;\le\; 5\sqrt{c_1(s/2)}\,\mathrm{f}_\infty\alpha_* a\Big[\mu_*^{2/s}+n^{-1/s}\Big]. \tag{8.23}$$

Similarly, for $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_{2s/(s+4)} \;\le\; \mu_*^{2/s}\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_2 \;\le\; 2\alpha_*\mu_*^{2/s}a^2\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\\
&n^{1/s}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_{s/2} \;\le\; 2C_{s/2}\alpha_* n^{-1/s}a^2\big\{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\big\}^{m_{s/2}}\\
&\Big[\sqrt{n}\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_2\|\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2]\|_{s/2}\Big]^{1/2} \;\le\; 2\sqrt{C_{s/2}}\alpha_* n^{-1/s}a^2\Big\{\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\vee[\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)]^{m_{s/2}}\Big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from the Hölder inequality and (8.19); the second one follows from (8.20); and the third line follows from the two previous inequalities. This yields

$$\sup_{\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\frac{\tilde{A}(\phi^2[\zeta_1]-\phi^2[\zeta_2])}{\mathrm{d}_*(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)} \;\le\; 5\mathrm{f}_\infty\sqrt{2c_1(s/2)}\alpha_* C_{s/2}\,a^2\big[\mu_*^{2/s}+n^{-1/s}\big].$$

Combining the last inequality with (8.23) we obtain

$$\lambda_{\tilde{A}} \;\le\; k_4\big[\mu_*^{2/s}+n^{-1/s}\big],\;\; k_4 := 5\mathrm{f}_\infty\sqrt{2c_1(s/2)}\alpha_* C_{s/2}.$$

Now in order to bound $\lambda_{\tilde{B}}$ we recall that $\tilde{B}(\phi^2[\zeta]) = \frac{4}{3}c_1(s/2)\|\phi^2[\zeta]\|_{s/2}$. Then (8.14) gives $\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{Z}_a}\tilde{B}(\phi^2[\zeta]) \le \frac{4}{3}c_1(s/2)\alpha_*^2 n^{-2/s}a^2$. This along with (8.20) leads to

$$\lambda_{\tilde{B}} \le k_5 n^{-2/s},\quad k_5 := \frac{8}{3}c_1(s/2)\alpha_*^2 C_{s/2}.$$

Combining these results with (3.19) and taking into account that, by (8.22), $\gamma = \mu^{-1/4} \le 1$ for $s \ge 4$, we have

$$\mu^{-1/4} = \sqrt{y_\gamma}\lambda_{\tilde{A}} + y_\gamma\lambda_{\tilde{B}} \le \big[\sqrt{y_\gamma}+y_\gamma\big](k_4\vee k_5)[\mu_*^{2/s}+n^{-1/s}],$$

and an elementary calculation shows that

$$y_\gamma \ge \mu^{-1/2}(k_4\vee k_5)^{-2}\big[\mu_*^{2/s}+n^{-1/s}\big]^{-2} =: y_*.$$

This inequality yields the constant ϑ_2 appearing in (8.4).

6^0. *Application of Theorem 3*. In order to apply Theorem 3 with the distance $\mathrm{d}_*(\cdot,\cdot)$ given in (8.11) we need to compute the quantity

$$L_{\exp}^{(\epsilon)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\exp\Big\{2\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}_*}\Big(\epsilon 2^{-k}\Big) - (9/16)\;2^k k^{-2}\Big\}.$$

Note that the entropy number $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}_*}(\cdot) = \ln\big\{N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}_*}(\cdot)\big\}$ is computed with respect to the distance d_*. Therefore we first express the entropy $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}_*}(\cdot)$ in terms of the original distance d and then, using Assumption (W4), we derive a bound for $L_{\exp}^{(\epsilon)}$.

By the definition of the distance d_*, for all $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\mathrm{d}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \le \big[k_*^{-1}\delta\big]^{1/m} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathrm{d}_*(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \le \delta,$$

where $m := 1 \wedge m_s$ if $s \in (2,4)$ and $m := 1 \wedge m_s \wedge m_{s/2}$ if $s \ge 4$. Therefore $N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}_*}(\delta) \le N_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}\big([k_*^{-1}\delta]^{1/m}\big)$. In view of Assumption (W4) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\delta\in(0,1)} \Big\{\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}_*}(\delta) - [k_*^{-1}\delta]^{-\beta/m}\Big\} &\le \sup_{\delta\in(0,1)} \Big\{\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}\big([k_*^{-1}\delta]^{1/m}\big) - [k_*^{-1}\delta]^{-\beta/m}\Big\} \\ &\le \sup_{x\in(0,1)} \Big\{\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z},\mathrm{d}}(x) - x^{-\beta}\Big\} = C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain that

$$L_{\exp}^{(\epsilon)} \le \exp\{2C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta)\} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp\Big\{2^{1+k\beta/m}(k_*^{-1}\epsilon)^{-\beta/m} - (9/16)\,2^k k^{-2}\Big\} = \exp\{2C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta)\} L_*^{(\epsilon)}(\beta).$$

Now the result of the theorem follows from the bounds of Theorem 3. The constants $T_{5,\epsilon}$ and $T_{6,\epsilon}$ given in the beginning of the proof are obtained from the expressions for $T_{1,\epsilon}$ and $T_{2,\epsilon}$ and bounds of Theorem 3. In particular, we used that in view of Lemma 6 $\sqrt{n}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{V}_0}\|w\|_s \le n^{\frac{s-2}{2s}}\alpha_*\mu^{1/s-1/2}\,\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2$. ∎

9. Proof of Theorem 7. The proof is based on verification of conditions and application of Theorem 5. First we establish auxiliary results that provide the basis for verification of Assumptions (L) and (W). Then, based on these results, we show that all conditions of Theorem 5 are fulfilled. This will yield the required result.

Let K and K' be any functions satisfying Assumptions (K1) and (K2), and let h, h' be given vectors from $\mathcal{H}$. Let $\zeta = (K,h)$, $\zeta' = \big(K', h'\big)$, and recall that $\phi_1[\zeta]$ is the mapping $(K,h) \mapsto n^{-1}K_h$.

Similarly, if K, Q, K', Q' are any functions satisfying Assumptions (K1) and (K2), and if $h, h', \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}'$ are vectors from $\mathcal{H}$ then $z = [(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})]$, $z' = [(K',h'),(Q',\mathfrak{h}')]$, and $\phi_2[z]$ is the mapping $[(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})] \mapsto n^{-1}(K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})$.

1^0. *Auxiliary results.* We begin with auxiliary results about properties of the mappings $\phi_1[\zeta]$ and $\phi_2[z]$. The proofs of these results are given in Appendix.

Define the function

$$D(x) := e^{dx}\Big[x + \frac{1}{2}L_{\mathcal{K}}\sqrt{d}(e^x - 1) + \mathrm{k}_\infty(e^{dx} - 1)\Big], \quad x \ge 0, \tag{9.1}$$

and put

$$\theta_1 := \big[\mathrm{k}_\infty/\mathrm{k}_1\big]D'(2), \qquad \theta_2 := 2^{2d+2}\mathrm{k}_\infty^4\mathrm{k}_1^{-2}D'(4), \tag{9.2}$$

where D' is the first derivative of the function D.

The next lemma states that Assumption (L) is fulfilled for the mappings $\zeta \mapsto \phi_1[\zeta]$ and $z \mapsto \phi_2[z]$.

LEMMA 9. *Let Assumption (K) hold, and $s \ge 1$. If the sets $\mathbb{Z}^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, are equipped with the distances $\mathrm{d}_{\theta_i}^{(i)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ then Assumption (L) is valid for the mappings $\zeta \mapsto \phi_1[\zeta]$ and $z \mapsto \phi_2[z]$.*

The next three statements provide a basis for verification of Assumption (W). For any $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}$ let $h \vee h' = (h_1 \vee h'_1, \dots, h_d \vee h'_d)$ and $h \wedge h' = (h_1 \wedge h'_1, \dots, h_d \wedge h'_d)$.

Lemma 10. *Let Assumptions (K1) and (K2) hold; then for any* $p \in [1, \infty]$

$$\|\phi_1[\zeta]\|_p \;=\; n^{-1} V_h^{-1+1/p} \|K\|_p, \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}, \tag{9.3}$$

$$\|\phi_1[\zeta] - \phi_1[\zeta']\|_p \;\le\; n^{-1} \Big(V_{h \vee h'} \Big)^{-1+1/p} D\Big(\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta, \zeta') \Big), \quad \forall \zeta, \zeta' \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)}, \tag{9.4}$$

$$\|\phi_2[z] - \phi_2[z']\|_p \;\le\; 2n^{-1} \mathrm{k}_\infty \Big[\big(V_{h \vee h'} \big) \vee \big(V_{\mathfrak{h} \vee \mathfrak{h}'} \big) \Big]^{-1+1/p} D\Big(2\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z, z') \Big), \quad \forall z, z' \in \mathbb{Z}^{(2)}. \tag{9.5}$$

Observe that Lemma 10 implies that Assumption (A2) of Section 3.2 is fulfilled for the mappings $\zeta \mapsto \phi_1[\zeta]$ and $z \mapsto \phi_2[z]$.

Lemma 11. *Let* $w \in \mathbb{H}_d(1, P)$ *with some* $P > 0$*, and let* $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *be a point such that* $w(\tilde{x}) = \|w\|_\infty > 0$*; then*

$$\Big\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \; |w(x)| \ge \frac{1}{2} \|w\|_\infty \Big\} \supseteq \bigotimes_{i=1}^{d} \left[\tilde{x}_i - \frac{\|w\|_\infty}{2P\sqrt{d}}, \; \tilde{x}_i + \frac{\|w\|_\infty}{2P\sqrt{d}} \right].$$

Lemma 12. *Under Assumption (K) for any* $p \ge 1$

$$(i) \qquad \big\| \phi_2[z] \big\|_p \le 2^{d/p} \, \mathrm{k}_\infty^2 n^{-1} \left(V_{h \vee \mathfrak{h}} \right)^{-1+1/p},$$

$$(ii) \qquad \big\| \phi_2[z] \big\|_p \ge 2^{\frac{d(1-p)}{p}} \, \mathrm{k}_1^2 n^{-1} \left(V_{h \vee \mathfrak{h}} \right)^{-1+1/p},$$

$$(iii) \qquad \mathrm{mes}\Big\{ \mathrm{supp}\big(\phi_2[z] \big) \Big\} \ge \left(V_{h \vee \mathfrak{h}} \right) \left[\frac{\mathrm{k}_1^2}{2^{d+1} \sqrt{d} L_{\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{k}_\infty} \right]^d,$$

$$(iv) \qquad \mathrm{mes}\left\{ t : \; \phi_2[z](t) \ge \frac{1}{2} \big\| \phi_2[z] \big\|_\infty \right\} \ge \left[\frac{\mathrm{k}_1^2}{2^{d+2} \sqrt{d} L_{\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{k}_\infty} \right]^d \mathrm{mes}\Big\{ \mathrm{supp}\big(\phi_2[z] \big) \Big\}.$$

2^0. *Verification of conditions of Theorem 5.* We check Assumption (W) for the classes of weights $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$ given by the parametrization $\phi_1[\zeta]$ and $\phi_2[z]$.

First we note that (W1) is fulfilled both for $\phi_1[\zeta]$ and $\phi_2[z]$ in view of Assumption (K1). Furthermore, Assumptions (K1) and (K2) together with Lemma 11 imply (W2) for $\phi_1[\zeta]$ with

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \alpha_2 = \alpha_{2,1} := \left[\frac{\mathrm{k}_1}{L_{\mathcal{K}} \sqrt{d}} \right]^d, \tag{9.6}$$

while the statement (iv) of Lemma 12 yield (W2) for $\phi_2[z]$ with the constants

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \alpha_2 = \alpha_{2,2} := \left[\frac{\mathrm{k}_1^2}{2^{d+2} \sqrt{d} L_{\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{k}_\infty} \right]^d. \tag{9.7}$$

Clearly, $\mathrm{mes}\{\mathrm{supp}(\phi_1[\zeta])\} \ge V_{h^{\min}}$; hence the condition

$$n V_{h^{\min}} \;>\; \left[64 c_1^2(s) \right]^{\frac{s \wedge 4}{s \wedge 4 - 1}}$$

implies (W3) for $\phi_1[\zeta]$ with $\mu = nV_{h^{\min}}$. It follows from the statement (iii) of Lemma 12 that Assumption (W3) holds for $\phi_2[z]$ with $\mu = nV_{h^{\min}}$ if

$$nV_{h^{\min}} \;>\; \alpha_{2,2}^{-1}\Big[64c_1^2(s)\Big]^{\frac{s\wedge 4}{s\wedge 4-1}}.$$

Finally, a standard calculation shows that if $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)$ is the entropy number of the set $\mathcal{H}$ measured in the distance $\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}$ [see (3.31)] then for any $\delta\in(0,1]$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot) \le d\ln(3/\delta) + \sum_{i=1}^{d}\Big(\ln\ln\big[h_i^{\max}/h_i^{\min}\big]\Big)_+. \tag{9.8}$$

This result together with (K3) guarantees that Assumption (W4) is fulfilled for the both parametrizations.

Now we compute the quantities m_p and C_p appearing in (3.27). Although Lemma 7 shows that we always can set $m_p = 2/p$, it turns out that under Assumption (K) we can put $m_p = 1$ for all $p \ge 2$ both for $\phi_1[\zeta]$ and for $\phi_2[z]$. This leads to weaker conditions on the entropy $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot)$ [see formulation of Theorem 5].

First consider the mapping $\phi_1[\zeta]$; here following (3.25) we set

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}(b) := \Big\{\zeta = (K,h) : n^{1/2}\|\phi_1[\zeta]\|_2 \le b\Big\} = \Big\{\zeta = (K,h) : (nV_h)^{-1/2}\|K\|_2 \le b\Big\}.$$

for $b \in [\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(1)}, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(1)}]$ where by (3.24)

$$\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(1)} \;\ge\; \mathrm{k}_1(nV_{h^{\max}})^{-1/2}, \quad \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(1)} \;\le\; \mathrm{k}_\infty(nV_{h^{\min}})^{-1/2}. \tag{9.9}$$

By (9.4) of Lemma 10 we have for any $p\ge 2$ and $\zeta_1 = (K,h)$, $\zeta_2 = (K',h')$

$$n^{1/p}\|\phi_1[\zeta_1] - \phi_1[\zeta_2]\|_p \le (nV_{h\vee h'})^{-1+1/p}\, D\Big(\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\Big),$$

and if $\zeta_1,\zeta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}(b)$ are such that $\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) \le 2$ then by definition of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}(b)$

$$n^{1/p}\|\phi_1[\zeta_1] - \phi_1[\zeta_2]\|_p \;\;\le\;\; \big[b/\mathrm{k}_1\big]^{2-2/p} D'(2)\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2),$$

where we have used that $\|K\|_2 \ge \|K\|_1 \ge \mathrm{k}_1$ for all $K\in\mathcal{K}$, $D(0)=0$, and D is monotone increasing. If $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in\mathbb{Z}_2^{(1)}(b)$ and $\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) > 2$ then by the triangle inequality, and (9.3) of Lemma 10

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/p}\|\phi_1[\zeta_1] - \phi_1[\zeta_2]\|_p &\;\le\; n^{1/p}\|\phi_1[\zeta_1]\|_p + n^{1/p}\|\phi_1[\zeta_2]\|_p \\ &\;\le\; 2\mathrm{k}_\infty(nV_h)^{-1+1/p} \le \mathrm{k}_\infty\big[b/\mathrm{k}_1\big]^{2-2/p}\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2). \end{aligned}$$

These inequalities show that if $\mathbb{Z}^{(1)}$ is equipped with the distance $\mathrm{d}_{\theta_1}^{(1)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ [see (9.2) for definition of θ_1] then (3.27) holds with

$$m_p = 1, \quad C_p = \theta_1^{-1}\big[\mathrm{k}_\infty/\mathrm{k}_1\big]^{2-2/p}D'(2) \le 1, \tag{9.10}$$

because $nV_{h^{\min}} \ge 1$ (which implies $b \le \mathrm{k}_\infty$).

Now consider the mapping $\phi_2[z]$; following (3.25) we have here

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^{(2)}(b) := \Big\{z = [(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})] : n^{1/2}\|\phi_2[z]\|_2 \le b\Big\}, \quad b\in\big[\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(2)},\, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(2)}\big]$$

where by the statements (i) and (ii) of Lemma 12

$$2^{-d/2}\,\mathrm{k}_1^2\,(nV_{h^{\max}})^{-1/2}\;\le\;\underline{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(2)},\qquad \bar{\mathrm{w}}_2^{(2)}\;\le\;2^{d/2}\,\mathrm{k}_\infty^2\,(nV_{h^{\min}})^{-1/2}\,. \tag{9.11}$$

Note that if $z=\big[(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})\big]\in\mathbb{Z}_2^{(2)}(b)$ then by the statement (ii) of Lemma 12 we have $\big(nV_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}}\big)^{-1}\le 2^d\mathrm{k}_1^{-4}b^2$. By this fact and by (9.5) of Lemma 10 we have for $z_1=[(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})]$, $z_2=[(K',h'),(Q',\mathfrak{h}')]\in\mathbb{Z}_2^{(2)}$ such that $\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2)\le 2$

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/p}\|\phi_2[z_1]-\phi_2[z_2]\|_p &\le 2\mathrm{k}_\infty\Big[\big(nV_{h\vee h'}\big)\vee\big(nV_{\mathfrak{h}\vee\mathfrak{h}'}\big)\Big]^{-1+1/p}D\Big(2\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2)\Big)\\ &\le 2^{d+2-d/p}\,\mathrm{k}_\infty\,\big[b/\mathrm{k}_1^2\big]^{2-2/p}D'(4)\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2) \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2)>2$ then using the triangle inequality and Lemma 12(i) we have

$$n^{1/p}\|\phi_2[z_1]-\phi_2[z_2]\|_p\;\le\;2^{d+1}\mathrm{k}_\infty^2\big[b/\mathrm{k}_1^2\big]^{2-2/p}\le 2^d\mathrm{k}_\infty^2\big[b/\mathrm{k}_1^2\big]^{2-2/p}\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2).$$

Combining these inequalities we observe that if $\mathbb{Z}^{(2)}$ is equipped with the distance $\mathrm{d}_{\theta_2}^{(2)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ [see (9.2)] then (3.27) holds with

$$m_p=1,\quad C_p=\theta_2^{-1}2^{2d+2-\frac{3d}{p}}\,\mathrm{k}_\infty^2\,\big[\mathrm{k}_\infty^2/\mathrm{k}_1\big]^{2-2/p}D'(4)\le 1. \tag{9.12}$$

We have used that $b\le 2^{d/2}\mathrm{k}_\infty^2$ because $nV_{h^{\min}}\ge 1$. Thus (9.10) and (9.12) show that $m=1$ and the condition $\beta<m$ of Theorem 5 holds if in Assumption (K3) $\beta_{\mathcal{K}}<1$.

3^0. *Application of Theorem 5.* First note that $\vartheta_0^{(i)}$, $i=1,2$ defined in (3.38) satisfy

$$\vartheta_{0,i}:=5c_1(s)\mathrm{f}_\infty\alpha_{*,i}\,,\quad \alpha_{*,i}:=2/\sqrt{\alpha_{2,i}},\quad i=1,2,$$

where $\alpha_{2,i}$, $i=1,2$ are given in (9.6) and (9.7). This is in accordance with the definition of the constant ϑ_0 in (3.29) for the parametrizations $\phi_1[\zeta]$ and $\phi_2[z]$. Then the definition of $C_{\xi,i}^*(y)$ in (3.40) corresponds to (3.29). Following (8.4) we put

$$\vartheta_{1,i}:=\alpha_{*,i}^{-4}/148,\quad \vartheta_{2,i}:=5\sqrt{2}c_1(s/2)\mathrm{f}_\infty\alpha_{*,i}^2,\quad i=1,2.$$

Then the formula for $y_*^{(i)}$ appearing in the statement of the theorem is a version of (3.30).

Now we need to specify the constants $T_{5,\epsilon}$ and $T_{6,\epsilon}$; see (8.6), (8.7).

Following (8.5) we set for $i=1,2$

$$k_{*,i}:=8c_1(s)\alpha_{*,i}^2,\quad L_{*,i}^{(\epsilon)}(\beta):=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\exp\Big\{2^{1+k\beta}(k_{*,i}^{-1}\epsilon)^{-\beta}-(9/16)\,2^kk^{-2}\Big\}.$$

In view of (9.8) and Assumption (K3) we obtain for any $\beta\in(\beta_{\mathcal{K}},1)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathbb{Z}^{(1)}}(\beta) &= \sup_{\delta\in(0,1)}\Big\{\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^{(1)},\mathrm{d}_{\theta_1}^{(1)}}(\delta)-\delta^{-\beta}\Big\}\;\le\;C_{\mathcal{K}}+C_{\beta,d}+\sum_{i=1}^{d}\Big(\ln\ln\big[h_i^{\max}/h_i^{\min}\big]\Big)_+\,,\\ C_{\mathbb{Z}^{(2)}}(\beta) &= \sup_{\delta\in(0,1)}\Big\{\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^{(2)},\mathrm{d}_{\theta_2}^{(2)}}(\delta)-\delta^{-\beta}\Big\}\;\le\;2C_{\mathcal{K}}+2C_{\beta,d}+2\sum_{i=1}^{d}\Big(\ln\ln\big[h_i^{\max}/h_i^{\min}\big]\Big)_+, \end{aligned}$$

where we have taken into account that $\theta_1 \geq 1$, $\theta_2 \geq 1$ and denoted

$$C_{\beta,d} := \sup_{\delta\in(0,1]} \Big[d\ln(3/\delta) + \delta^{-\beta_{\mathcal{K}}} - \delta^{-\beta}\Big], \quad \beta \in (\beta_{\mathcal{K}}, 1).$$

Therefore for $i = 1, 2$

$$L^{(\epsilon)}_{*,i}(\beta)\exp\{2C_{\mathbb{Z}^{(i)}}(\beta)\} \leq \big[1 + A_{\mathcal{H}}\big]^i \exp\{2iC_{\mathcal{K}}\} \inf_{\beta\in(\beta_{\mathcal{K}},1)} \Big[L^{(\epsilon)}_{*,i}(\beta)\exp\{2iC_{\beta,d}\}\Big],$$

and, by Assumption (K3), (9.8) and (3.39)

$$N_{\mathbb{Z}^{(i)},\mathrm{d}^{(i)}_{\theta_i}}\big(k_{*,i}^{-1}\epsilon/8\big) \leq \big[1 + A_{\mathcal{H}}\big]^i \Big[24k_{*,i}\theta_i/\epsilon\Big]^{di} \exp\left\{i\left(\frac{8k_{*,i}\theta_i}{\epsilon}\right)^{\beta_{\mathcal{K}}}\right\}\exp\{iC_{\mathcal{K}}\}.$$

Finally, substituting these bounds in (8.6) and using (9.9), (9.11), and (3.39) we have that

$$T^{(i)}_{5,\epsilon} \quad\leq\quad (1 + A_{\mathcal{H}})^{2i}(1 + B_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{T}^{(i)}_1,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{T}^{(i)}_{1,\epsilon} \quad:=\quad & I_\epsilon(q)\Big(2^{1+d/2}u_\epsilon k_{*,i}\mathrm{k}_\infty^2\Big)^q\Big[24k_{*,i}\theta_i\epsilon^{-1}\Big]^{di}\exp\left\{i\left(\frac{8k_{*,i}\theta_i}{\epsilon}\right)^{\beta_{\mathcal{K}}}\right\}\exp\{3iC_{\mathcal{K}}\}\\ & \times\ \log_2\left(\frac{2^d\mathrm{k}_\infty^2 k_{*,i}}{\mathrm{k}_1^2}\right)\left\{1 + \inf_{\beta\in(\beta_{\mathcal{K}},1)}\Big[L^{(\epsilon)}_{*,i}(\beta)\exp\{2iC_{\beta,d}\}\Big]\right\}, \quad i = 1, 2.\end{aligned}$$

This leads to the first statement of the theorem. The second statement of the theorem follows substitution of the above bounds in (8.7) which gives $T^{(i)}_{6,\epsilon} \leq (1 + A_{\mathcal{H}})^{2i}(1 + B_{\mathcal{H}})\tilde{T}^{(i)}_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{T}^{(i)}_{2,\epsilon} \quad:=\quad & [c_1(s) + 2]^q\Big(2^{d/2}\alpha_{*,i}\mathrm{k}_\infty^2\Big)^q\Big[24k_{*,i}\theta_i\epsilon^{-1}\Big]^{di}\exp\left\{i\left(\frac{8k_{*,i}\theta_i}{\epsilon}\right)^{\beta_{\mathcal{K}}}\right\}\exp\{3iC_{\mathcal{K}}\}\\ & \times\log_2\left(\frac{2^d\mathrm{k}_\infty^2 k_{*,i}}{\mathrm{k}_1^2}\right)\left\{1 + \inf_{\beta\in(\beta_{\mathcal{K}},1)}\Big[L^{(\epsilon)}_{*,i}(\beta)\exp\{2iC_{\beta,d}\}\Big]\right\}, \quad i = 1, 2.\end{aligned}$$

■

10. Proofs of Theorems 8 and 9.

10.1. *Proof of Theorem 8.* Let $X' = (X, \varepsilon)$, and let X'_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$ be independent copies of X'. For any $l > 0$, $x' = (x, u) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$ define the function

$$w^{(l)}(t, x') = w(t, x)u\,\mathbf{1}_{[-l,l]}(u).$$

With this notation we note that on the event $\big\{\max_{i=1,\dots,n}|\varepsilon_i| \leq l\big\}$

$$\eta_w(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n w(t, X_i)\varepsilon_i = \sum_{i=1}^n w^{(l)}(t, X'_i) = \xi_{w^{(l)}}(t),$$

and the last equality holds because $\mathbb{E}w^{(l)}(t,X')=0$, for all $t\in\mathcal{T}$ and $l>0$ because the distribution of ε is symmetric. Therefore for any $z>0$

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}\ \geq\ z\big\}\ \leq\ \mathbb{P}\big\{\|\xi_{w^{(l)}}\|_{s,\tau}\geq z\big\}+n\mathbb{P}\big\{|\varepsilon|>l\big\}.$$

If Assumption (E1) is fulfilled then for any $z>0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}\geq z\right\}\ \leq\ \mathbb{P}\left\{\|\xi_{w^{(l)}}\|_{s,\tau}\geq z\right\}+nv\exp\left\{-bl^{\alpha}\right\}. \tag{10.1}$$

If Assumption (E2) is fulfilled then for any $z>0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}\geq z\right\}\ \leq\ \mathbb{P}\left\{\|\xi_{w^{(l)}}\|_{s,\tau}\geq z\right\}+n\,Pl^{-p}. \tag{10.2}$$

In order to bound the first term on the right hand side of (10.1) and (10.2) we repeat the steps in the proof of Theorem 1 with w replaced by $w^{(l)}$ and optimize with respect to the truncation level l.

For any $z>0$ we define

$$\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)=\frac{z^2}{\frac{1}{3}\varpi_s^2(w,f)+\frac{4}{3}c_*(s)M_s(w)z}\ ,$$

where $c_*(s)$ is given in (3.2).

First consider the case $s\geq 2$. Using the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 1 we have the following upper bound: for all $z>0$

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{\|\xi_{w^{(l)}}\|_{s,\tau}\geq\varrho_s(w,f)+z\big\}\leq\exp\big\{-[1\vee l]^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big\}. \tag{10.3}$$

Under Assumption (E1) if we set

$$l=\begin{cases}\big[b^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} & b^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)<1,\\ \big[b^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big]^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}} & b^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\geq 1\end{cases}$$

then it follows from (10.1) and (10.3) that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}\geq\varrho_s(w,f)+z\right\}\leq G^{(1)}\big(\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big).$$

Thus, the first statement of the theorem is proved if $s\geq 2$.

If Assumption (E2) is fulfilled then we choose

$$l=\frac{\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)}{p\ln\big(1+p^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big)}$$

and note that $l\geq 1$ for any value of $\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)$. Then (10.2) and (10.3) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}\geq\varrho_s(w,f)+z\right\}\leq\left[\frac{1}{\big(1+p^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big)}\right]^p+nP\left[\frac{p\ln\big(1+p^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big)}{\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)}\right]^p.$$

Using the trivial inequality $(1+u)^{-1}\leq u^{-1}\ln(1+u),\ u\geq 0$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\eta_w\|_{s,\tau}\geq\varrho_s(w,f)+z\right\}\leq[1+nP]\left[\frac{p\ln\big(1+p^{-1}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big)}{\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)}\right]^p$$

and, therefore, the second statement of the theorem is proved for the case $s\geq 2$.

If $s<2$ then we have similarly to (10.3) that for all $z>0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\xi_{w^{(l)}}\|_{s,\tau}\geq\varrho_s(w,f)+z\right\}\leq\exp\big\{-[1\vee l]^{-2}\Upsilon_s(w,f,z)\big\}.$$

The same computations as in the case $s\geq 2$ lead to the statement of the theorem when $s<2$. ∎

10.2. *Proof of Theorem 9.* Put

$$L^{(\epsilon)}_{\alpha,b} := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp\left\{\epsilon^{-\beta} 2^{\beta k+1}\right\} \sqrt{g_{\alpha,b}\big(9\cdot 2^{k-3}k^{-2}\big)}, \qquad J^{(\epsilon)}_{\alpha,b} := q\int_1^{\infty} (x-1)^{q-1}\big[g_{\alpha,b}(x)\big]^{\frac{1}{4}}\mathrm{d}x,$$

$$T_{n,\epsilon} := (1+nv)\big[2^{2\epsilon}(1+\epsilon)\mathrm{a}\bar{\mathrm{w}}_2\big]^{q}\big[2^{q\epsilon}-1\big]^{-1}\exp\left\{C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta)+(8/\epsilon)^{\beta}\right\}\Big(1+\exp\left\{2C_{\mathbb{Z}}(\beta)\right\}L^{(\epsilon)}_{\alpha,b}\Big)\,J^{(\epsilon)}_{\alpha,b}.$$

We note that $L^{(\epsilon)}_{\alpha,b} < \infty$ since $\beta < \alpha/(2+\alpha)$ if $s < 2$, and $\beta < \alpha/(1+\alpha)$ if $s \geq 2$. Note also that the quantity $J^{(\epsilon)}_{g}(\cdot)$ in the second inequality of Corollary 1 admits the following bound if $g = G_1$:

$$J^{(\epsilon)}_{g}(z) \leq (1+nv)\big[g_{\alpha,b}(z)\big]^{1/4}\Big(1+L^{(\epsilon)}_{\alpha,b}\Big)\,J^{(\epsilon)}_{\alpha,b}, \quad z>0.$$

If for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}$ we let

$$U_\eta\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) = \mathrm{a}\sqrt{n}\big\|\phi[\zeta]\big\|_2, \quad A_\eta\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) = \mathrm{b}_n\sqrt{n}\big\|\phi[\zeta]\big\|_2, \quad B_\eta\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) = \mathrm{c}_n\sqrt{n}\big\|\phi[\zeta]\big\|_2,$$

then we have for $f \in \mathcal{F}$

$$\varrho_s\big(\phi[\zeta],f\big) \leq U_\eta\big(\phi[\zeta]\big), \quad \frac{1}{3}\varpi^2_s\big(\phi[\zeta],f\big) \leq A^2_\eta\big(\phi[\zeta]\big), \quad \frac{4}{3}c_*(s)M_s\big(\phi[\zeta]\big) \leq B_\eta\big(\phi[\zeta]\big).$$

Thus, in view of Theorem 8, Assumption 1 holds with $U = U_\eta$, $A = A_\eta$, $B = B_\eta$ and $g = G^{(1)}$. Then standard computations show that $\Lambda_{A_\eta} = \mathrm{b}_n$ and $\Lambda_{B_\eta} = \mathrm{c}_n$. The assertion of the theorem follows now from Corollary 1. ∎

11. Appendix.

Proof of Lemma 4. Let

$$\mathcal{X}^{(n)} = \underbrace{\mathcal{X}\times\cdots\times\mathcal{X}}_{n-\text{times}}, \qquad \bar{\mathcal{X}}^{(n)} = \underbrace{\bar{\mathcal{X}}\times\cdots\times\bar{\mathcal{X}}}_{n-\text{times}}.$$

Obviously, $\bar{\mathcal{X}}^{(n)}$ is a countable dense subset of $\mathcal{X}^{(n)}$. For any $x^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(n)}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$ put

$$\xi\big(t,x^{(n)}\big) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[w\big(t,x_i\big) - \mathbb{E}w(t,X)\right],$$

and let

$$\mathfrak{L} = \left\{ l_{\bar{x}^{(n)}} : \mathcal{T}\to\mathbb{R}:\; l_{\bar{x}^{(n)}}(t) = \frac{\big|\xi\big(t,\bar{x}^{(n)}\big)\big|^{s-1}\operatorname{sign}\big[\xi\big(t,\bar{x}^{(n)}\big)\big]}{\big\|\xi\big(\cdot,\bar{x}^{(n)}\big)\big\|^{s-1}_{s,\tau}}, \quad \bar{x}^{(n)} \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}^{(n)} \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{L}$ is countable and $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathbb{B}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}$ since, obviously

$$\|l_{\bar{x}^{(n)}}\|_{\frac{s}{s-1},\tau} = 1, \quad \forall \bar{x}^{(n)} \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}^{(n)}.$$

Note that $\xi_w(\cdot) = \xi\big(\cdot,X^{(n)}\big)$, $X^{(n)} = (X_1\dots,X_n)$, and therefore, in order to prove the assertion of the lemma it is sufficient to show that

$$\Big\|\xi\big(\cdot,x^{(n)}\big)\Big\|_{s,\tau} = \sup_{l\in\mathfrak{L}}\int l(t)\xi\big(t,x^{(n)}\big)\tau(\mathrm{d}t), \quad \forall x^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(n)}. \tag{11.1}$$

First let us note that Assumption (A1) implies that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $x^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(n)}$ there exists $\bar{x}^{(n)} \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}^{(n)}$ such that

$$\left\| \xi\big(\cdot, x^{(n)}\big) - \xi\big(\cdot, \bar{x}^{(n)}\big) \right\|_{s,\tau} \leq \varepsilon. \tag{11.2}$$

Taking into account that $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathbb{B}_{\frac{s}{s-1}}$ and using the Hölder inequality we obtain from (11.2) that

$$\left| \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \int l(t)\xi\big(t, x^{(n)}\big)\tau(\mathrm{d}t) - \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \int l(t)\xi\big(t, \bar{x}^{(n)}\big)\tau(\mathrm{d}t) \right| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{11.3}$$

Obviously

$$\left\| \xi\big(\cdot, \bar{x}^{(n)}\big) \right\|_{s,\tau} = \int l_{\bar{x}^{(n)}}(t)\xi\big(t, \bar{x}^{(n)}\big)\tau(\mathrm{d}t).$$

It implies in view of the duality argument that

$$\left\| \xi\big(\cdot, \bar{x}^{(n)}\big) \right\|_{s,\tau} = \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \int l(t)\xi\big(t, \bar{x}^{(n)}\big)\tau(\mathrm{d}t). \tag{11.4}$$

Using the triangle inequality we obtain from (11.2), (11.3) and (11.4) that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $x^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(n)}$

$$\left| \left\| \xi\big(\cdot, x^{(n)}\big) \right\|_{s,\tau} - \sup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \int l(t)\xi\big(t, x^{(n)}\big)\tau(\mathrm{d}t) \right| \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

which completes the proof of (11.1) because $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrary small. ∎

Proof of Lemma 5. First note that for any $p \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\|\bar{w}(\cdot, x)\|_{p,\tau} \leq 2^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \left[\int |w(t,x)|^p \, \tau(\mathrm{d}t) + \int \mathbb{E}|w(t,X)|^p \tau(\mathrm{d}t) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 2 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|w(\cdot, x)\|_{p,\tau}.$$

Here we have used the triangle inequality. Next, for any $p \geq 1$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\int |\bar{w}(t,x)|^p f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x) \right]^{1/p} &:= \left[\mathbb{E}|\bar{w}(t,X)|^p\right]^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2\left[\mathbb{E}|w(t,X)|^p\right]^{1/p} =: 2\left[\int |w(t,x)|^p f(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x) \right]^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $\mathbb{E}|\eta - \mathbb{E}\eta|^p \leq 2^p \mathbb{E}|\eta|^p$. Combining both inequalities we have

$$M_p(\bar{w}) \leq 2M_p(w),$$

and the second statement of the lemma is proved.

∎

Proof of Lemma 9.

1^0. First we establish statement of the lemma for the mapping $\zeta \mapsto \phi_1[\zeta]$. For any $s \geq 1$ let $\mathfrak{s} := s \wedge 2$. Following (3.24) and (3.25) and in view of (9.3) we have

$$\underline{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)} \geq \mathrm{k}_1 (nV_{h^{\max}})^{1/\mathfrak{s}-1}, \quad \bar{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)} \leq \mathrm{k}_\infty (nV_{h^{\min}})^{1/\mathfrak{s}-1},$$

$$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)}(b) := \Big\{ \zeta = (K,h) \in \mathbb{Z}^{(1)} : \ \big(nV_h\big)^{1/\mathfrak{s}-1} \|K\|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq b \Big\}, \quad b \in \big[\underline{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)}, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)}\big].$$

We note that if $\zeta = (K,h) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)}(b)$ then

$$(nV_h)^{1/\mathfrak{s}-1} \leq \mathrm{k}_1^{-1} b. \tag{11.5}$$

Let $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)}(b)$ be such that $\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}\big(\zeta_1,\zeta_2\big) \leq 2$. Applying (9.4) with $p = \mathfrak{s}$ and using (11.5) we get

$$n^{1/\mathfrak{s}} \|\phi_1\big[\zeta_1\big] - \phi_1\big[\zeta_2\big]\|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \mathrm{k}_1^{-1} b D'(2) \mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}\big(\zeta_1,\zeta_2\big) = b\, \mathrm{d}_{\theta_1}^{(1)}\big(\zeta_1,\zeta_2\big). \tag{11.6}$$

Here we have taken into account that $D'(2) = \sup_{x\in[0,2]} |D'(x)|$, where the function $D(\cdot)$ is given in (9.1). If $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(1)}(b)$ are such that $\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}\big(\zeta_1,\zeta_2\big) > 2$, then by the triangle inequality

$$n^{1/\mathfrak{s}} \|\phi_1\big[\zeta_1\big] - \phi_1\big[\zeta_2\big]\|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq 2b \leq b\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}\big(\zeta_1,\zeta_2\big) \leq b\mathrm{d}_{\theta_1}^{(1)}\big(\zeta_1,\zeta_2\big). \tag{11.7}$$

Thus (11.6) and (11.7) imply that that Assumption (L) holds if $\mathbb{Z}^{(1)}$ is equipped with the distance $\mathrm{d}_{\theta_1}^{(1)}$, where we recall that $\theta_1 = \mathrm{k}_\infty \mathrm{k}_1^{-1} D'(2) \geq 1$ [see (9.2)].

2^0. Now we prove the statement of the lemma for the mapping $z \mapsto \phi_2[z]$. By the statements (i) and (ii) of Lemma 12 applied with $p = \mathfrak{s}$ we have

$$2^{\frac{d(1-\mathfrak{s})}{\mathfrak{s}}} \mathrm{k}_1^2 \left(nV_{h^{\max}}\right)^{1/\mathfrak{s}-1} \ \leq \ \underline{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)}, \qquad \bar{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)} \ \leq \ 2^{d/\mathfrak{s}} \mathrm{k}_\infty^2 \left(nV_{h^{\min}}\right)^{1/\mathfrak{s}-1}.$$

Remind that

$$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)}(b) := \Big\{ z = \big[(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})\big] \in \mathbb{Z}^{(2)} : \ n^{1/\mathfrak{s}} \big\|\phi_2[z]\big\|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq b \Big\}, \quad b \in \big[\underline{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)}, \bar{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)}\big].$$

If $z = \big[(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})\big] \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)}(b)$ then by the statement (ii) of Lemma 12

$$\left(n\ V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}}\right)^{1/\mathfrak{s}-1} \ \leq \ 2^{\frac{d(\mathfrak{s}-1)}{\mathfrak{s}}}\ \mathrm{k}_1^{-2} b \ \leq \ 2^{d/2} \mathrm{k}_1^{-2} b. \tag{11.8}$$

Let $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)}(b)$ be such that $\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}\big(z_1,z_2\big) \leq 2$. Applying (9.5) with $p = \mathfrak{s}$ and using (11.8) we obtain

$$n^{1/\mathfrak{s}} \big\|\phi_2[z_1] - \phi_2[z_2]\big\|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq b 2^{2+d/2} \mathrm{k}_\infty \mathrm{k}_1^{-2} D'(4)\, \mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2). \tag{11.9}$$

If $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathfrak{s}}^{(2)}(b)$ are such that $\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2) > 2$ then we have by the triangle inequality

$$n^{1/\mathfrak{s}} \big\|\phi_2\big[z_1\big] - \phi_2\big[z_2\big]\big\|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq 2b \leq b\, \mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z_1,z_2). \tag{11.10}$$

Thus (11.9) and (11.10) imply that Assumption (L) is valid provided that $\mathbb{Z}^{(2)}$ is equipped with the distance $\mathrm{d}_{\theta_2}^{(2)}(\cdot,\cdot)$, where $\theta_2 = 2^{2d+2} \mathrm{k}_\infty^4 \mathrm{k}_1^{-2} D'(4) \geq 2^{\frac{d+4}{2}} \mathrm{k}_\infty \mathrm{k}_1^{-2} D'(4) \geq 1$ [see (9.2)]. ∎

Proof of Lemma 10. 1^0. The inequality (9.3) is immediate. We start with the proof of (9.4).

Since the required bound is symmetric in h and h', without loss of generality we will assume that $V_h \geq V_{h'}$. By the triangle inequality in view of Assumption (K1) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_h - K'_{h'}\|_p &\leq \|K_h - K'_h\|_p + \|K'_h - K'_{h'}\|_p \leq V_h^{-1+1/p}\|K - K'\|_p + \|K'_h - K'_{h'}\|_p \\ &\leq V_h^{-1+1/p}\left[\|K - K'\|_\infty + \mathrm{k}_\infty\left(\frac{V_h}{V_{h'}} - 1\right)\right] + V_{h'}^{-1}\big\|K'(\cdot/h) - K'(\cdot/h')\big\|_p \\ &\leq (V_{h\vee h'})^{-1+1/p}\left[\frac{V_{h\vee h'}}{V_{h\wedge h'}}\right]\left[\|K - K'\|_\infty + \mathrm{k}_\infty\left(\frac{V_{h\vee h'}}{V_{h\wedge h'}} - 1\right)\right] \\ &\qquad + (V_{h\vee h'})^{-1+1/p}\left[\frac{V_{h\vee h'}}{V_{h\wedge h'}}\right]\Big\|K'\big(\,\cdot\,[h\vee h']/h\big) - K'\big(\,\cdot\,[h\vee h']/\,h'\big)\Big\|_p, \end{aligned} \tag{11.11}$$

where $h \wedge h' = (h_1 \wedge h'_1, \ldots, h_d \wedge h'_d)$. The second term of the last inequality is obtained using the evident change–of–variables $t \mapsto t/[h \vee h']$ (the division is understood in the coordinate–wise sense).

Note that all coordinates of the vectors $[h \vee h']/h$ and $[h \vee h']/h'$ are greater or equal to 1. Therefore, in view of Assumption (K1) the integration (or supremum if $p = \infty$) over the whole $\mathbb{R}^d$ in $\|K'\big(\,\cdot\,[h\vee h']/h\big) - K'\big(\,\cdot\,[h\vee h']/\,h'\big)\|_p$ can be replaced by the integration (supremum) over the support of K'. Together with Assumption (K1) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\|K'\big(\,\cdot\,[h\vee h']/h\big) - K'\big(\,\cdot\,[h\vee h']/\,h'\big)\Big\|_p &\leq L_{\mathcal{K}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{d}\left[\frac{h_j \vee h'_j}{h_j \wedge h'_j} - 1\right]^2} \\ &\leq 2^{-1}L_{\mathcal{K}}\sqrt{d}\big(\exp\big\{\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(h,h')\big\} - 1\big). \end{aligned} \tag{11.12}$$

Noting that $V_{h\vee h'}/V_{h\wedge h'} \leq \exp\big\{d\,\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(h,h')\big\}$ we obtain from (11.11) and (11.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|K_h - K'_{h'}\|_p \\ &\leq \Big(V_{h\vee h'}\Big)^{\frac{1-p}{p}} e^{d\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(h,h')}\Big[\|K - K'\|_\infty + \mathrm{k}_\infty\Big(e^{d\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(h,h')} - 1\Big) + \frac{L_{\mathcal{K}}\sqrt{d}}{2}\Big(e^{\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(h,h')} - 1\Big)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{11.13}$$

Then (9.4) follows from the last inequality and the monotonicity of the function $D(\cdot)$.

2^0. Now we turn to the proof of (9.5). Recall that $z = [(K,h),(Q,\mathfrak{h})]$ and $z' = [(K',h'),(Q',\mathfrak{h}')]$. For brevity we also write $\zeta_K = (K,h)$ and $\zeta_Q = (Q,\mathfrak{h})$ with evident changes in notation for ζ'_K and ζ'_Q.

By the triangle inequality we have

$$\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - K'_{h'} * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p \leq \|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - K_h * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p + \|K_h * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'} - K'_{h'} * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p. \tag{11.14}$$

Using the Young inequality (the first statement of Lemma 3), Assumption (K1) and (11.13) we obtain

$$\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - K_h * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p \;\leq\; \|K_h\|_1\|Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p \;\leq\; \mathrm{k}_\infty\,(V_{\mathfrak{h}\vee\mathfrak{h}'})^{-1+1/p}D\big(\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_Q,\zeta'_Q)\big).$$

On the other hand, applying the Young inequality and (11.13) with $p = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - K_h * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p &\leq \|K_h\|_p\|Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_1 \;\leq\; \mathrm{k}_\infty V_h^{-1+1/p}D\big(\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_Q,\zeta'_Q)\big) \\ &\leq \mathrm{k}_\infty\,\big(V_{h\vee h'}\big)^{-1+1/p}\exp\{d\,\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(h,h')\}D\big(\mathrm{d}_1^{(1)}(\zeta_Q,\zeta'_Q)\big) \\ &\leq \mathrm{k}_\infty\,\big(V_{h\vee h'}\big)^{-1+1/p}D\big(2\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z,z')\big), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definition of $\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and monotonicity of the function $D(\cdot)$. Combining the last two inequalities we have

$$\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - K_h * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p \;\;\leq\;\; \mathrm{k}_\infty \Big[\big(V_{h\vee h'}\big) \vee \big(V_{\mathfrak{h}\vee\mathfrak{h}'}\big)\Big]^{-1+1/p} D\big(2\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z,z')\big).$$

Repeating the previous computations we obtain the same bound for the second term on the right hand side of (11.14), namely,

$$\|K_h * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'} - K'_{h'} * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p \;\;\leq\;\; \mathrm{k}_\infty \Big[\big(V_{h\vee h'}\big) \vee \big(V_{\mathfrak{h}\vee\mathfrak{h}'}\big)\Big]^{-1+1/p} D\big(2\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z,z')\big).$$

Thus, we finally get

$$\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}} - K'_{h'} * Q'_{\mathfrak{h}'}\|_p \;\;\leq\;\; 2\mathrm{k}_\infty \Big[\big(V_{h\vee h'}\big) \vee \big(V_{\mathfrak{h}\vee\mathfrak{h}'}\big)\Big]^{-1+1/p} D\big(2\mathrm{d}_1^{(2)}(z,z')\big),$$

as claimed. ■

Proof of Lemma 11. If $w \in \mathbb{H}_d(1,P)$ then for any

$$x \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^{d} \left[\tilde{x}_i - \frac{\|w\|_\infty}{2P\sqrt{d}},\; \tilde{x}_i + \frac{\|w\|_\infty}{2P\sqrt{d}}\right]$$

we have by the triangle inequality

$$|w(x)| \;\geq\; |w(\tilde{x})| - |w(x) - w(\tilde{x})| \;\geq\; \|w\|_\infty - P|x-\tilde{x}| \;\geq\; \frac{1}{2}\|w\|_\infty.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Proof of Lemma 12. Recall that

$$\phi_2[z](t) = (K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})(t) = \int K_h(t-y)Q_{\mathfrak{h}}(y)\mathrm{d}y, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

1^0. Let $\mathcal{J}$ denote the set of indexes $j \in \{1,\dots,d\}$ such that $h_j \leq \mathfrak{h}_j$:

$$\mathcal{J} := \big\{j \in (1,\dots,d) : h_j \leq \mathfrak{h}_j\big\}.$$

Given two arbitrary vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\Delta[u,v]$ and $\delta[u,v]$ denote the vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the coordinates

$$\Delta_j[u,v] = \begin{cases} u_j, & j \in \mathcal{J}, \\ v_j, & j \notin \mathcal{J}, \end{cases} \qquad \delta_j[u,v] = \begin{cases} u_j, & j \notin \mathcal{J}, \\ v_j, & j \in \mathcal{J}. \end{cases}$$

With this notation we can write

$$(K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})(t) = \frac{1}{V_h V_{\mathfrak{h}}} \int K\bigg(\Delta\Big[\frac{t-v}{h}, \frac{v}{h}\Big]\bigg) Q\bigg(\delta\Big[\frac{t-v}{\mathfrak{h}}, \frac{v}{\mathfrak{h}}\Big]\bigg)\mathrm{d}v, \;\; t \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then changing the variables $v \mapsto u = (t-v)/(h \wedge h')$ and setting for brevity $\eta = (h \wedge \mathfrak{h})/(h \vee \mathfrak{h})$ (as usual, all operations are understood in the coordinate–wise sense) we come to the formula

$$\begin{aligned} (K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})(t) &= \frac{V_{h\wedge\mathfrak{h}}}{V_h V_{\mathfrak{h}}} \int K\Big(\Delta\Big[u, t/(h\vee\mathfrak{h}) - \eta u\Big]\Big) Q\Big(\delta\Big[t/(h\vee\mathfrak{h}) - \eta u, u\Big]\Big)\mathrm{d}u \\ &= \frac{1}{V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}}} F\bigg(\frac{t}{h\vee\mathfrak{h}}\bigg), \end{aligned} \tag{11.15}$$

where we have denoted

$$F(t) := \int K\Big(\Delta[u, t-\eta u]\Big)\, Q\Big(\delta[t-\eta u, u]\Big)\mathrm{d}u, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{11.16}$$

Now we note some properties of the function F that will be useful in the sequel. First, Assumption (K1) implies that the integration over $\mathbb{R}^d$ in (11.16) can be replaced by the integration over $[-1/2, 1/2]^d$. Indeed, if at least one of the coordinates of u lies outside the interval $[-1/2, 1/2]$ then, in view of (K1), one of the functions K or Q vanishes. This fact along with Assumption (K2) and (11.16) imply that $\|F\|_\infty \le \mathrm{k}_\infty^2$; in addition,

$$\mathrm{supp}(F) \subseteq [-1, 1]^d. \tag{11.17}$$

Taking into account these facts and using (11.15) we obtain

$$\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_p \;\le\; (V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}})^{-1+1/p} \|F\|_p \;\le\; 2^{d/p}\, \mathrm{k}_\infty^2\, (V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}})^{-1+1/p},$$

and the statement (i) of the lemma is proved.

To get the assertion (ii) of the lemma we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \bigg|\int F(t)\mathrm{d}t\bigg| &= \bigg|\int\!\!\int K\Big(\Delta[u, t-\eta u]\Big) Q\Big(\delta[t-\eta u, u]\Big)\mathrm{d}u\,\mathrm{d}t\bigg| \\ &= \bigg|\int K(x)\mathrm{d}x\bigg|\,\bigg|\int Q(x)\mathrm{d}x\bigg| \;\ge\; \mathrm{k}_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the fact functions K and Q are integrated over t and over u over disjoint sets of components; and the last inequality is a consequence of (K2). Therefore, invoking (11.17) we have

$$\|G\|_p = (V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}})^{-1+1/p}\, \|F\|_p \ge \Big(2^d V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}}\Big)^{-1+1/p}\, \|F\|_1 \ge 2^{\frac{d(1-p)}{p}}\, \mathrm{k}_1^2\, (V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}})^{-1+1/p},$$

as claimed in the statement (ii) of the lemma.

2^0. Now we turn to the proof of the statements (iii) and (iv) of the lemma. The idea in the proof of these statements is to show that F satisfies the Lipschitz condition and then to apply Lemma 11.

By (11.16) for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F(x) - F(y)| &\le \mathrm{k}_\infty \sup_{u\in[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]^d} \Big|K\Big(\Delta[u, x-\eta u]\Big) - K\Big(\Delta[u, y-\eta u]\Big)\Big| \\ &\quad + \mathrm{k}_\infty \sup_{u\in[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]^d} \Big|Q\Big(\delta[x-\eta u, u]\Big) - Q\Big(\delta[y-\eta u, u]\Big)\Big| \\ &\le L_{\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{k}_\infty \bigg\{\sqrt{\sum_{j\notin\mathcal{J}} \big(x_j - y_j\big)^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \big(x_j - y_j\big)^2}\bigg\} \;\le\; 2L_{\mathcal{K}}\mathrm{k}_\infty |x-y|. \end{aligned} \tag{11.18}$$

The obtained inequality means that $F \in \mathbb{H}_d(1,P)$ with $P = 2L_{\mathcal{K}}\mathrm{k}_\infty$; moreover, (11.17) implies that

$$\|F\|_\infty \geq 2^{-d}\,\mathrm{k}_1^2. \tag{11.19}$$

Applying Lemma 11 and using (11.18) we obtain

$$\Big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d :\ F(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|F\|_\infty\Big\} \supseteq \bigotimes_{i=1}^{d}\left[\tilde{x}_i - \frac{\|F\|_\infty}{2P\sqrt{d}},\ \tilde{x}_i + \frac{\|F\|_\infty}{2P\sqrt{d}}\right],$$

where, recall, $F(\tilde{x}) = \big\|F\big\|_\infty$. Using (11.19) we obviously deduce from (11.15) that

$$\Big\{x :\ (K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_\infty\Big\} \supseteq \bigotimes_{i=1}^{d}\left[\tilde{x}_i(h\vee\mathfrak{h})_i - \frac{\mathrm{k}_1^2(h\vee\mathfrak{h})_i}{2^{d+1}P\sqrt{d}},\ \tilde{x}_i(h\vee\mathfrak{h})_i + \frac{\mathrm{k}_1^2(h\vee\mathfrak{h})_i}{2^{d+1}P\sqrt{d}}\right],$$

which implies that

$$\operatorname{mes}\Big\{x :\ (K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_\infty\Big\} \ \geq\ V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}}\ \left[\frac{\mathrm{k}_1^2}{2^{d+1}\sqrt{d}L_{\mathcal{K}}\mathrm{k}_\infty}\right]^d. \tag{11.20}$$

Then the statement (iii) of the lemma follows because

$$\operatorname{mes}\Big\{\operatorname{supp}(K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})\Big\} \geq \operatorname{mes}\Big\{x :\ (K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_\infty\Big\}.$$

It remains to note that (11.17) implies that $\operatorname{mes}\{\operatorname{supp}(K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})\} \leq 2^d\ V_{h\vee\mathfrak{h}}$. Therefore by (11.20)

$$\operatorname{mes}\Big\{x :\ (K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}}\|_\infty\Big\} \geq \left[\frac{\mathrm{k}_1^2}{2^{d+2}\sqrt{d}L_{\mathcal{K}}\mathrm{k}_\infty}\right]^d \operatorname{mes}\{\operatorname{supp}(K_h * Q_{\mathfrak{h}})\}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ∎

References.

Alexander, K. S. (1984). Probability inequalities for empirical processes and a law of the iterated logarithm. *Ann. Probab.* **12**, 1041–1067.

von Bahr, B. and Esseen, C.-G. (1965). Inequalities for the rth absolute moment of a sum of random variables, $1 \leq r \leq 2$. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **36**, 299–303.

Barron, A., Birgé, L. and Massart, P. (1999). Risk bounds for model selection via penalization. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **113**, 301–413.

Beirlant, J. and Mason, D. M. (1995). On the asymptotic normality of $\mathbb{L}_p$–norms of empirical functionals. *Math. Methods Statist.* **4**, 1-19.

Bousquet, O. (2002). A Bennett concentration inequality and its application to suprema of empirical processes. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **334**, 495–500.

Cavalier, L. and Golubev, Yu. (2006). Risk hull method and regularization by projections of ill-posed inverse problems. *Ann. Statist.* **34**, 1653–1677.

Devroye, L. and Lugosi, G. (2001). *Combinatorial Methods in Density Estimation.* Springer, New York.

Dümbgen, L. and Fatalov, V. R. (2002). Asymptotics of the rate of convergence for nonparametric density estimators: a new approach based on the Laplace method. *Math. Methods Statist.* **11**, 465-476.

Einmahl, U. and Mason, D. M. (2000). An empirical process approach to the uniform consistency of kernel-type function estimators. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **13**, 1–37.

Folland, G. B. (1999). *Real Analysis. Modern Techniques and Their Applications.* Second edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Giné, E. and Koltchinskii, V. (2006). Concentration inequalities and asymptotic results for ratio type empirical processes. *Ann. Probab.* **34**, 1143-1216.

Giné, E., Koltchinskii, V. and Zinn, J. (2004). Weighted uniform consistency of kernel density estimators. *Ann. Probab.* **38**, 2570–2605.

Giné, E., Mason, D. M. and Zaitsev, A. Yu. (2003). The $\mathbb{L}_1$–norm density estimator process. *Ann. Probab.* **31**, 719–768.

Giné, E. and Nickl, R. (2008). Uniform central limit theorems for kernel density estimators. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **141**, 333–387.

Giné, E. and Zinn, J. (1984). Some limit theorems for empirical processes. *Ann. Probab.* **12**, 928–989.

Goldenshluger, A. and Lepski, O. (2008). Universal pointwise selection rule in multivariate function estimation. *Bernoulli* **14**, 1150-1190.

Goldenshluger, A. and Lepski, O. (2009). Structural adaptation via L_p–norm oracle inequalities. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **143**, 41-71.

Golubev, Y. and Spokoiny, V. (2009). Exponential bounds for minimum contrast estimators. *Electron. J. Stat.* **3**, 712–746.

Johnson, W. B., Schechtman, G. and Zinn, J. (1985). Best constants in moment inequalities for linear combinations of independent and exchangeable random variables. *Ann. Probab.* **13**, 234–253.

Ledoux, M. and Talagrand, M. (1991). *Probability in Banach Spaces.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Massart, P. (2000). About the constants in Talagrand's concentration inequalities for empirical processes. *Ann. Probab.* **28**, 863–884.

Pinelis, I. (1990). Inequalities for distributions of the sums of independent random vectors and their application to the estimation of a density. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **35**, 605–607.

Pinelis, I. (1994). Optimum bounds for the distributions of martingales in Banach spaces. *Ann. Probab.* **22**, 1679–1706.

Talagrand, M. (1994). Sharper bounds for Gaussian and empirical processes. *Ann. Probab.* **22**, 28–76.

van de Geer, S. (2000). *Applications of Empirical Process Theory.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes.* Springer, New York.

Department of Statistics
University of Haifa
Haifa 31905, Israel
E-mail: goldensh@stat.haifa.ac.il

Laboratoire d'Analyse, Topologie, Probabilités
Université Aix-Marseille 1
39, rue F. Joliot-Curie
13453 Marseille, France
E-mail: lepski@cmi.univ-mrs.fr